REFERENCE ONLY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON THESIS

Degree PhD Year 2005 Name of Author BALLESTEROS C.

THE ESTABLISHING SHOT, FILM SPACE AND THE CZECHOSLOVAK NEW WAVE

Cesar Ballester
School of Slavonic and East European Studies,
University College London
PhD Thesis

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

In this thesis I have attempted to reveal the aetiology of the absence of the establishing shot in the editing style of the Czechoslovak New Wave. I have demonstrated that the Czechoslovak New Wave had a unique way of editing that differentiated it from those other so-called new cinemas, which were also questioning the continuity style. Never in the history of sound cinema had so many films been edited with such a large number of scenes that lacked the establishing shot. The absence of the establishing shot in these films provokes several questions. I answer the question why the New Wave questions the continuity style. Most scholarly works on the New Wave have argued that the dramatic change in style of these films was the result of a strong reaction against Socialist Realism. This answers the question only partially, though it is true that Socialist Realism in film rigidly followed the conventions established in the continuity style. My thesis, however, is centred on the other two questions provoked by the absence of the establishing shot. The first of these is why the continuity style does not collapse as a narrative medium without the establishing shot, or rather, how the continuity style works if no establishing shot is needed. Secondly, and this is the ultimate aim of the thesis, it attempts to ascertain why the Czech and Slovak directors employed what might be referred to as the non-establishing-shot technique. It is, indeed, a reaction to Socialist Realism and to a socialist society, but my thesis attempts, I believe for the first time, to understand specially how. The thesis is divided into three parts. Parts I and II analyse the nature of film space and in particular how it is perceived by the spectator. Since the Czechoslovak New Wave questions the spatial conventions of the continuity style I devote Part I to an historical analysis of the origins, development, and institutionalization of the continuity style. Part II provides a theoretical discussion on the nature of film space and how the spectator perceives spatial continuity by means of editing, that is, a close study of the theories of montage developed by Lev Kuleshov, Vsevolod Pudovkin, Béla Balázs, Sergei Eisenstein, and the Czechs Jan Mukařovský and Jan Kučera. These theorists had a completely different approach to spatial continuity. They all shared a central idea, that of semantic completion, and had a direct influence in the development of the New Wave editing techniques, through the person of Kučera, who taught theory of montage at FAMU to the New Wave directors. Part III constitutes a practical shot analysis of those New Wave films where the non-establishing-shot technique has been employed. The aim of Part III is to find in what ways the themes present in 1960s Czechoslovakia were conveyed by means of montage.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I gratefully acknowledge the invaluable help of the following persons and institutions: first of all that of my supervisors, Professor Robert Pynsent, Professor Julian Graffy, and Dr Philip Cavendish; secondly that of Renata Clark, from the Czech Centre in London; Peter Hames; Věra Chytilová; Jiří Menzel; Alejandro Mehdevi; Eva Papoušková; Věra Viceniková, from Bolton in Prague; Vladimir Opěla and Briana Cechová, Director and Head of the Historical Department respectively at the Narodní Filmový Archiv in Prague; staff at the NFA library; Richard Kováčik, Manager of the Film Archive Department at the Slovenský Filmový Ústav; Zdena Škapová; and all the staff at the SSEES Library. Finally I would like to thank my friends and family for their support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

INTRODUCTION

Between 1962 and 1970 the Czechoslovak film industry produced a series of remarkable films which came to be collectively known as the Czechoslovak New Wave, which was sometimes referred to as the Czechoslovak film miracle. These films radically broke with Socialist Realist aesthetics, absorbing and developing the stylistic innovations that had been carried out by other 'new' cinemas in France, Great Britain and Poland since the late 1950s. In Czechoslovakia, filmmakers of five generations took part in this 'miracle'. The oldest generation were those filmmakers who had started their careers in the 1930s, as Avant-garde filmmakers under the influence of the Devětsil group of intellectuals, led by Karel Teige. They included directors such as Martin Frič, Elmár Klos (who later coupled with Jan Kádár to win an Oscar for best foreign picture in 1965 for Obchod na korze (The shop on the main street), Jiří Lehovec, Jiří Weiss, and Otakar Vávra, who played a significant role in the foundation of the Prague Film School, FAMU. These Avant-garde filmmakers later succumbed to commercialism and, after the war, to the rules of Socialist Realist directives as laid down by the Central Committee of the Communist Party. The second generation started making films only after the Second World War. Directors such as Jiří Krejčík or Miroslav Hubáček began by making melodramas or films concerned with the immediate past but soon, like the previous generation, were sucked into the machinery of Socialist Realism. The third generation, who had been formed as filmmakers entirely in the Socialist state, was the first generation to react against official aesthetic norms. Some of them, like Vojtěch Jasný and Karel Kachyna, were amongst the first FAMU graduates since its foundation in 1947. Others, like Zbyněk Brynych and Ladislav Helge had trained in the nationalized industry itself, at the Barrandov Studios, as director's assistants. Their attempts, however, to break away from official norms came under strong attack from Stalinist authorities; this prevented this generation from developing new ideas on film until much later. It was in 1962, a new political thaw was under way, that the fourth generation of filmmakers (those who graduated from FAMU in the early and mid-1960s - the one exception being Miloš Forman who graduated in 1955, though he did not direct his first film until 1963) managed to break away completely from Socialist Realist aesthetics. The members of this generation were all FAMU graduates: Hynek Bočan, Věra Chytilová, Miloš Forman, Jaromil Jireš, Pavel Juráček, Ivan Passer, Antonín Máša, Jiří Menzel, Jan Němec, and Evald Schorm. My thesis considers this fourth generation (together with some members of a later, fifth, generation) as the sole representatives of the Czechoslovak New Wave. These were the filmmakers who genuinely experimented with the new cinematographic language being developed in the West and made it their own. They led the way and influenced the previous generations (one only has to see the dramatic change in style adopted by Otakar Vávra after the appearance of the New Wave,

for example in Romance pro křídlovku (Romance for a buglehorn, 1966), where he imitates, masterfully, the style of the films of the young filmmakers. The films of these young directors marked the beginning of the New Wave in 1962/63. It is, however, not easy to place the Slovaks (all of them FAMU graduates) into the different generations of the Czech directors. While Juraj Jakubisko, Dušan Hanák and Elo Havetta constitute what could be referred as the fifth generation, Peter Solan and Stefan Uher do not, strictly speaking, belong to any of the generations. Chronologically they could belong to the third, together with Jasný and Helge, but Solan, unlike them, did not react against Socialist Realism until Boxer a smrt' (The boxer and death, 1962) and even then this film still contains many elements of Socialist Realism. Uher, on the other hand, did not shoot his first feature film until 1961, more or less at the same time as the Czech New Wave directors were starting their careers, and it was in fact Uher's second feature film Slnko v sieti (Sun in the net, 1962) that officially marked the beginning of the New Wave.

The young FAMU graduates used film as a means to observe, analyse, and ultimately discover the 'socialist' reality around them, that is, the society that had resulted after fifteen years of Communist rule. They had been taught as students at FAMU that the only true work of art was one that was true to the existing reality. No other work of art could be considered socialist. Ironically, by being sincere, they did not create true socialist works in the way these teachers conceived of them, at least, openly, but films that questioned socialist reality, and the hypocrisy inherent in that reality. The aim, however, of the authorities, throughout the Soviet Bloc, had been to use film as a means to help build the Socialist society. In Czechoslovakia this aim was already functioning during the 1920s. Lenin's statement, claiming that 'of all the arts film is the most important', had been adopted by the Czech Avant-garde, in particular by the Devětsil group, in their programme. Devětsil considered film to be at the centre of the Avant-garde movement; film was more important than literature, painting, theatre and so on, because of its popularity amongst the working classes and because of the consequent capacity of the film to transmit socialist ideas to the workers. As a new art form film was the only art that would fulfill the functions that Socialism wanted for art: to educate the proletariat to be class conscious; educate the proletariat to became the elite, that would then build a Socialist society.[1] Devětsil, influenced at the beginning by the Soviet Proletkult,[2] first believed that the way to reach the proletariat and educate it was for 'high' art to find inspiration using the arts and genres which were popular with the proletariat. Thus, at this first stage, the proletariat would be able to assimilate easily the socialist content found in the popular arts with which they were familiar and comfortable. At a later stage, once they were being educated to become an elite, the proletariat would be drawn towards the 'high' arts. The humble descend of the Avant-garde artists was only temporary. The popular film genres were cowboy movies,

[1] See Devětsil, Jaroslav Seifert and Karel Teige (eds), Sborník, I, 1922, p.5.
[2] A. French, The Poets of Prague, London, 1969, p.69 ff.

slapstick comedies, melodramas; their chief representatives were, Douglas Fairbanks, Charlie Chaplin, and Mary Pickford. The members of the Devětsil championed these genres and their stars. At the same time, however, Devětsil's members were aware of the photographic nature of film, and considered it a powerful aesthetic tool, to discover reality: 'Film, yes film [...] is an uninterrupted series of new pioneering realities'.[3] Through films one sees things in a different way and thus discovers their essence. It was not long before the Devětsil group realized that these discoveries could not be achieved by means of the popular genres. By 1924, Devětsil, Teige in particular, regarded Proletarian Art as sterile (at least if it followed Lunacharsky's guidelines[4]) and gradually grew tired of popular film genres (with the exception of Charlie Chaplin, Buster Keaton and a few others), which had become repetitive, conventional, and mediocre, so they began to shift their attention towards the Avant-garde films coming from France: the cinema of Abel Gance, Louis Delluc, Jean Epstein, Fernand Leger, and the unrealized projects of P.A. Birot.[5] These French directors were exploring the objectivity captured by the film camera together with the use of visual metaphors, that is, a more poetic cinema, which coincided with the group's turning away from Proletarian Art to Poetism, that is, to mainly life poetry, as opposed to functional poetry, containing those elements in civilization, which 'would give man recreation'.[6] Devětsil regarded these visual metaphors based on observable reality as a more powerful means of discovering reality. Being artists the members of Devětsil could not help being drawn back to 'high' art sooner than they might have planned. Consciously or unconsciously, and without necessarily abandoning their political convictions, Devětsil saw, and could not help seeing, art, film, as a fascinating tool for discovering the reality around them, and not as a medium to educate the proletariat into class consciousness. The ideas of the Devětsil and particularly the films of the French Avant-garde influenced the work of Czech Avant-garde filmmakers. Their films experiment with both objective reality and visual metaphors. Most members of this Czech Avant-garde, for example Jan Kučera and Otakar Vávra, later taught the students at FAMU. Even though these Avant-garde directors also formed part of the Communists authorities' 'second attempt' to educate the proletariat in the 1950s by means of Socialist Realist films, they transmitted some of that Avant-garde spirit for formal experimentation and search for reality.

The New Wave, however, differed from the Devětsil and later Avant-garde filmmakers of the 1930s in their degree of experimentation. The Avant-garde started by working outside the mainstream narrative film industry (by making purely visual abstract films, or, indeed, by making experimental advertisements for the shoe-manufacturers Bat'a in

[3] Jindrich Honzl, 'O proletárském divadle', in Sborník, p.93.
[4] French, p.65.
[5] See Karel Teige, Film, Prague, 1925. For the shift in Devetsil's approach to popular genres compare the articles written in 1922 with those written in 1924.
[6] French, p. 34.

Zlín). The New Wave, on the other hand, worked within mainstream narrative cinema. The Czechoslovak New Wave as a film movement has to be analyzed as part of a world wide phenomenon in which the continuity style was questioned as the only mode of cinematographic narrative representation. Italian Neo-realism planted the seed in the 1940s. In the late 1950s and 1960s the continuity style is being questioned in Britain by the Free Cinema; in France by the French New Wave (together with Neo-realism perhaps the most influential); in Poland by the Polish School; in Hungary by the Hungarian new wave; by the 'Black Wave' in Yugoslavia ; on the other side of the Atlantic, by 'independent' filmmakers in the USA, and by the Cinema Nuovo in Brazil.

When watching the films of the Czechoslovak New Wave one will soon notice what distinguished these films from those that were products of other movements, was a persistent absence of the establishing shot in an abundant number of scenes, something that will strike one as unusual, since filmmakers and theorists argue that the continuity style is essential and that this is based on the establishing shot. In other words, unlike most film movements of the time, the Czechoslovak New Wave was questioning the very essence of the continuity style by removing its central element, without which, it is claimed, the style would collapse. Watching the Czechoslovak New Wave films shows that this claim is unfounded: the establishing shot is not necessary to create the so called continuity.

The absence of the establishing shot in New Wave films provokes several questions. First of all, why does the New Wave question the continuity style? Most scholarly works on the New wave have argued that the dramatic change in style of these films was the result of a strong reaction against Socialist Realism. This answers the question only partially, given that Socialist Realism in film rigidly followed the conventions established in the continuity style. But most of scholars, in the West and East, tend to play down the importance of contextualizing the New Wave within the phenomenon which was taking place worldwide. Most works treating the New Wave do not attempt any analysis of the films at a stylistic and technical level. This failure to explain how the reaction to Socialist Realism took place on a stylistic and technical level prevents discussing the important role formal experimentation per se had in the New Wave. The New Wave is not only a reaction to Socialist Realist aesthetics, but also an expression of the sheer enjoyment of experimenting with the aesthetic possibilities of a medium, of an art.

My thesis, however, is centred on the other two questions provoked by the absence of the establishing shot in New Wave films. The first of these is why the continuity style does not collapse as a narrative medium without the establishing shot, or rather, how the continuity style works if no establishing shot is needed. Secondly, and this is the ultimate aim of the thesis, it attempts to ascertain why the Czech and Slovak directors employed what could be referred to as the non-establishing-shot technique. It is a reaction to Socialist Realism and to

a socialist society, but my thesis attempts, I believe for the first time, to understand specifically how.

The thesis is divided into three parts. Parts I and II analyse the nature of film space and in particular how it is perceived by the spectator. Since the Czechoslovak New Wave questions the spatial conventions of the continuity style I devote Part I to an historical analysis of the origins, development, and institutionalization of the continuity style. Most of my discussion, which questions the traditional views on the continuity style and the exaggerated importance given to the role of the establishing shot, is based on the work of 'revisionist' scholars such as Bordwell, Burch, Elsaesser, Fairservice, Thompson, and Salt. These 'revisionist' scholars provide a history of cinema in which the continuity style (or classical Hollywood style) is not the natural language of cinema (a language that cannot develop further since it has reached perfection), but one which has emerged as the dominant style. In this dominant style film space plays a specific role: to convey the narrative.

Part II provides a theoretical discussion on the nature of film space and how the spectator perceives spatial continuity by means of editing. A close study of the theories of montage developed by Lev Kuleshov, Vsevolod Pudovkin, Béla Balázs, Sergei Eisenstein, and the Czechs Jan Mukařovský and Jan Kučera. These theorists had a completely different approach to spatial continuity and had a direct influence in the development of the New Wave editing techniques, through the figure of Kučera. This theorist, virtually unknown in the West (as far as I know, only Guido Aristarco mentions him briefly in Storia delle teoriche del film, Turin, 1963) and insufficiently discussed or studied by Czech and Slovak scholars, taught theory of montage at FAMU to the New Wave directors. He was not interested in prescriptive rules or conventional norms but in understanding and explaining how spatial continuity works. He regarded the establishing shot not as a necessary element but merely as one more aesthetic choice. Traditional works on film editing (like for example, those of Karel Reisz and Gavin Millar, The Technique of Film Editing, London, 1968, and, more recently, Roger Crittenden, Film and Video Editing, London, 1995) do not make any serious attempt to discuss the nature of film space and its perception by the spectator. Furthermore, they misunderstand, and render superficial, Pudovkin's theory; they fail to grasp the implications Eisenstein's theory of montage had for spatial continuity (and as far as I know, there is no serious study on this aspect of Eisenstein's theory); and they virtually ignore Balázs (one is surprised to see how little has been written about his theory of film). Part II, then, provides a close analysis of each these theories of montage, and applies them to the study of spatial continuity.

Part III is what I believe to be the first attempt in the West to study the Czechoslovak New Wave from a technical angle. Czech and Slovak scholars have provided scarce material on the technical aspects (editing) or on the connected matter of how themes are conveyed

technically. Part III constitutes a practical shot analysis of those New Wave films where the non-establishing-shot technique has been employed. I have tried to include as many Slovak films as possible, since Western scholars have tended to ignore Slovak films in favour of Czech, that is, they have tended to focus the study of the Czechoslovak New Wave only on the Czech side. I hope I have managed to reverse this trend. The aim of Part III is to find in what ways the themes present in 1960s Czechoslovakia were conveyed by means of montage. The ultimate aim of my thesis is to reveal the aetiology of the absence of the establishing shot in the films of the Czechoslovak New Wave.

PART I

ORIGINS OF THE CONTINUITY STYLE
THE ROLE OF THE ESTABLISHING SHOT

TRADITIONAL VIEWS ON THE CONTINUITY STYLE AND THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ESTABLISHING SHOT.

The first years of the 1960s saw what was probably the apogee of the questioning of the 'continuity style' (henceforth CS). This period of questioning started at the end of World War II with, on the one side, Italian Neo-Realism, and on the other, the full blown experimentalism of the American Underground, with Maya Deren as its chief representative. The Czechoslovak New Wave formed part of this 'attack' on the CS. What I believe differentiates the Czechoslovak New Wave from other 'movements' of the time (for example preceding them in time was the French New Wave or the Free Cinema) is that the directors of the Czechoslovak New Wave systematically questioned one element of the CS, perhaps the key element, or at least the element on which most importance has been laid by the champions of the CS, and which other 'movements' of the late 1950s and the 1960s did not, or, if they did, only very occasionally. The Czechoslovak New Wave questioned the relevance of the establishing shot (henceforth ES). I will analyse in later chapters what precisely the Czechoslovak New Wave was questioning with its disregard for the ES, and why. In this chapter I shall begin by discussing what the CS is and how it developed. Likewise I shall discuss what an ES is and its apparent role within the CS. The CS had become the dominant aesthetic system (to use Bordwell's terminology[1]) and was, and it seems that it still is, the only aesthetic option allowed or rather prescribed by both the film industry, and most Western historians (Bordwell refers to them as Standard Version Historians[2]), theorists, recorders of techniques, that is, technicians (film editors, directors, and so on) and self-proclaimed 'film-grammarians'. These traditionalists regarded, and regard, the CS as a set of rules, or norms, which must be rigidly followed; they regard the CS as an aesthetical axiom, not as 'an established or widely accepted truth'[3] but actually as 'a self evident truth'.[4] The CS is the natural film language, metaphysically pre-existing like some Platonic idea waiting to be discovered. In the 1970s and early 1980s there was a series of historians (historians of style and revisionists, as Bordwell calls them, himself included[5]) and theorists carried

---

[1] Bordwell, David; Stager, J; Thompson, K, The Classical Hollywood Cinema, New York, 1985, p. 4. (Henceforth Bordwell, Stager, Thompson)

[2] Bordwell, David, On the History of Film Style, Cambridge, Mass. 1997, passim.

[3] Concise Oxford Dictionary, Eighth Edition, Oxford, 1990.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Bordwell, On the History of Film Style, passim.

out research into the early period of cinema, questioning the validity of those conceptions of the CS defended by traditional histories, 'grammars' and theories of film editing.

The CS is thus called because it suggests the smooth continuity of the narrative action by means of 'invisible' editing. This type of editing is referred to as 'invisible' since, it is argued, by making the transitions between shots as smooth as possible (avoiding so called 'jumps') the spectator will not notice these transitions, will not notice the editing, which thus becomes 'invisible' to the eyes of the beholder. It developed and was eventually established in America (it is referred to by Bordwell, Stager and Thompson as the Classical Hollywood Style) and then spread and was adopted world wide. This aesthetic system subordinates two of its aesthetic sub-systems, those of cinematic time and cinematic space, to the narrative system.[6] In other words, in the CS film time and film space are subordinated to the action, to the narrative. A narrative which is based on 'logic', that is, a cause-effect narration. In terms of editing, spatial continuity has to provide the action continuity: every cut in a film, every spatial transition (showing the space where the action takes place) has to be motivated dramatically, that is, the only justification for a cut is to make the action to move forward. This is achieved by implementing a rigid set of norms, or so the traditionalists argue. The key element, the key norm, in this set, the element which seemingly forms the basis for the other elements to function, is the ES. The full set of norms (I do not list them in any specific order suggesting a hierarchy of importance) is as follows:

Match-on-action. When, in a transition between two shots, both shots show a character or an object moving, the cut has to be made at the precise moment when the movement of the first shot 'matches' (that is, it is as similar as possible) the movement in the second shot, and this in terms not only of time but also of space. The movement has to be matched roughly in the same part of the frame in both shots. Thus, the transition is smoothed and the spectator perceives the movement as a continuous action and does not notice the cut[7]. And even though technical books on the subject give it quite a lot of importance, apparently this type of cut was expensive both in time and money and therefore rarely used. It is found in only 12 per cent of

[6] Bordwell, Stager, Thompson, p.6

[7] Reisz, Karel; Millar, G, The Technique of Film Editing, 2nd edn., London, 1968, p.217 (henceforth Reisz and Millar); Dancyger, Ken, The Technique of Film and Video Editing, 2nd edn., Boston, 1997, p.295(henceforth Dancyger); Arijon, D, Grammar of the Film Language, Beverly Hills, 1976, passim (henceforth Arijon).

classical Hollywood movies[8].

Eye-line match. In a shot-reverse shot sequence (henceforth SRS) the eye lines of both characters (for example in a dialogue sequence), that is the direction of the gazes of each character have to be opposed, matched. For example, a medium shot (henceforth MS) or close up (henceforth CU) of a character looking off-screen right will be followed in the editing sequence by a MS or CU of the other character looking off-screen left[9]. The spectator will perceive that both characters are looking at each other.

180° axis. This is an imaginary line cut across the eye lines of two (main) characters in a scene and which divides the space where the action is taking place in two, leaving the 'spectator always on the same side of the action'[10]. That is, the camera always shoots from one side of the space where the action is taking place. The axis provides the spectator, according to Crittenden with a 'left to right orientation'[11] of the scene, of the action. It preserves, by not crossing the axis, the sense of direction (both of movement and of eye lines) from one shot to the other[12]. This line cannot be crossed, by the camera in editing, unless a character or the camera itself move physically in real space and time within the shot. In this case the axis will be redrawn. Otherwise, if the camera crosses the line in the editing, the spectator becomes disorientated (one of the many dubitable received truths of the CS).

Continuity of direction. Characters must retain the same direction from shot to shot. That is, if one character is moving from the right to the left of the screen in one shot the same direction must be maintained in the subsequent shot. Likewise if a character exits the frame left, in the subsequent shot he/she must enter the frame right[13].

Frame size and camera angles Paradoxically in relation to invisible cutting the spectator must appreciate that there has been a significant change in the size of the frame and the angle of the camera within the transition of shots. Some technicians state that the change of camera angle must be at least 30° [14];others maintain that it must be 90°[15].

Matching tone. The lighting and tones (of black, whites, colours) has to be similar in

---

[8] Bordwell, Stager, Thompson, p.46.
[9] Ibid. see also Crittenden, R, Film and Video Editing, London, 2000, p.41 (henceforth Crittenden) and Arijon , passim.
[10] Bordwell, Stager, Thompson, p.56.
[11] Crittenden, p.4. See also Arijon, passim.
[12] Reisz and Millar, p.222.
[13] Bordwell, On the History of Film Style p.57; Reisz and Millar, p.222; Crittenden, p.43, Arijon, passim; Dancyger, p.295.
[14] Reisz and Millar, p.220; Dancyger, p.295.
[15] Crittenden, p.43.

each shot of the sequence[16].

SRS and point of view shot (henceforth POV) The former, we remember, is a sequence whereby two series of shots (each showing a different character for example in a dialogue) will be alternated showing how each character reacts to the other. The latter is a shot that in showing a character, object or landscape, pretends to have been shot from the point of view of another character (the most important character dramatically at that moment in the film)[17].

Establishing shot. The ES is a shot which shows all the space relevant to the action of the sequence or scene. It is normally shown at the beginning of the scene, but it may also be shown at the end[18].

Cross cutting and parallel editing.[19] Cross cutting is when the cuts between two actions are related to each other within the same scene but (relatively) distant in space (in a way the SRS sequence is a form of cross cutting). Parallel editing cuts between two actions distant in space and time but which will eventually meet (relate causally) - the term is then misleading.

Analytical editing. This term simply means that all cuts must be motivated by the action, that is, motivated by a dramatic cause-effect need[20].

In keeping with the above norms a typical scene in the CS would start with an ES, followed by one or two shots in either plan-americain (henceforth PA) or medium long shots (henceforth MLS), then followed by eye line matched SRS and finishing with another ES[21].

These norms all function in order to achieve the spatial orientation of the spectator within the scene, to provide a spatial continuity and thus a means of narrative continuity. The traditionalists agree that all the above norms are necessary in order to achieve this spatial orientation. Indeed all of them prescribe them except for Karel Reisz and Edward Dmytryk who argue that dramatic norms have priority over the spatial norms. According to Dmytryk, if dramatically justified the matching does

---

[16] Reisz, p.226.
[17] Bordwell, On the History of Style, p.56.; Crittenden, p.90.
[18] Arijon, passim; Bordwell, On the history of Film Style, p.57; Crittenden. P. 41; Dancyger, p. 302; Reisz and Millar, 225.
[19] Bordwell, On the History of Film Style, p.46.
[20] Arijon, passim; Bordwell, On the history of Film Style, p.56-57; Crittenden, p. 85; Reisz and Millar, p. 226.
[21] Arijon, passim; Bordwell, On the History of Film Style, p. 65; Dancyger, p. 302; Reisz and Millar, p.24.

not have to be observed and the spectator will not notice the mismatch anyway[22]. Only one rule must never be broken (and here all the traditionalists agree), that of the ES. The ES must always be shown during a scene, otherwise the whole CS would collapse. Without the ES the spectator would not be able to orientate himself/herself within the space of the scene. The ES provides the spectator with the whole space where the scene is taking place in one single shot and in this way the he/she is able to orientate himself/herself through the narration. According to the traditionalists the ES shows the movement which will be then matched on action in the closer frames; the ES shows both eye lines of the characters intervening in a dialogue; the ES establishes the axis; the ES shows the direction of the movement of both actors and/or objects; the ES will provide the position of the characters thus allowing the spectator to know where each character is in relation to the other characters/objects in subsequent shots, when the angle of the camera and size of the frame have changed (likewise with the SRS and POV); the ES provides the 'master' lighting and tones for the scene; and so on.

Close examination of the definitions of the ES the glossaries of several technical and theoretical works on film editing give reveals the extent to which the ES is thought to support the continuity style. The definition to be found in Lindgren's The Art of the Film (which I believe is the first attempt at defining the ES in print.) runs as follows: 'establishing shot (n.), long shot introduced at the beginning of a scene to establish the interrelationship of details to be shown subsequently in nearer shots.'[23]

This definition does not specify what kind of interrelationships are established, whether they are spatial, temporal or dramatic.[24] Neither does it specify the nature of the details interrelated. – spatial, temporal or dramatic. Nor does it specify why these details are subsequently shown. None of the three aspects is specified; or all three together seem to be implied. However the definition only becomes accurate (and precise) when it is taken for granted that the interrelationships and the details have a spatial character. That is, the spectator is shown in one long shot where each character or object is situated in relation to the other characters or objects. It also has to be

[22] Dmytryk, E, On Film Editing, Boston, 1985, p.44 (henceforth Dmytryk); Reisz and Millar, p.216.
[23] Lindgren, E, The Art of the Film, London, 1948, p. 205 (henceforth Lindgren). Curiously enough, also in 1948 the term appears, and is translated, in a small English-Czech, Czech-English dictionary of photographic and cinematographic terms (Gutler, F, Fotografický a filmový slovníček, Prague, 1948, p.20) The translation given into Czech is 'informační záběr'. It is/was rarely used, the most common term being 'celek' (whole).
[24] Cf. Bordwell's tripartite system in Bordwell, Stager, Thompson, pp. 6-8.

understood that the dramatic interrelationship is to be developed in the subsequent shots in the spatial details of a long shot. This spatial 'preference' is understood from the texts themselves. For example in Reisz's The Technique of Film Editing, which includes in its glossary[25] the same definition as Lindgren's (the only difference is that the long shot has changed into 'usually long shot'), the author argues in the body of the text 'that a sequence which introduces a new locale should start by establishing the topographical relationship between the players and the background'[26]. Further down the page he states that 'if a big close-up is used it should be preceded by an image which shows that detail in its setting.'[27] That is, the image should set the detail in a spatial interrelationship. It is therefore clearer that in the ES the emphasis is placed on space. The ES establishes the space. The narration is only developed subsequently in the closer shots (MSs and CUs[28]). In other words the ES supports the continuity of the narration.

An analysis of another, more elaborate, definition from Crittenden again shows that the ES is considered to have an essentially spatial character which supports the development of the narration: 'ES: the wide shot of a location or set that presents the full context of a scene to a viewer, thus allowing subsequent fragments of the scene to be perceived within its totality. In editing it is so more effective to refrain from showing this until it is relevant dramatically'[29]. From the start this definition places the emphasis on space, on the location. A total space where the whole dramatic context (if that is what is implied by 'the full context of the scene') is presented to the spectator. Again space is supporting the narration: the need is perceived to show the whole of a real space in order subsequently to develop the film narration. It seems that film narrative cannot develop without the filmic space provided as a whole by the ES. This support function is further implied by stating that the ES should be shown when it is 'relevant dramatically'. This 'dramatic relevance' might also imply that the ES has a dramatic function, but a close reading of Crittenden (in particular chapter 2 'Shooting with cutting in mind'pp.36-53) shows that in reality he has spatial relevance in mind – everything in the closer shots must refer back spatially to the wider shot. For example the eye line: 'Even if we take a close-up of one of the characters from

[25] Reisz and Millar, p.399.
[26] Ibid, p.225.
[27] Ibid
[28] The definition appears word for word (except that yet again only one word has been changed from Reisz's definition) thirty years later in Dancyger,, p.362.
[29] Crittenden, p.169.

exactly in front, the angle of the head and the look of the eyes must match that established in the wider shot'[30]. That is spatial relevance and not dramatic as Crittenden might wish to suggest. If the relevance where to be a dramatic one the match would be irrelevant, just as Dmytryk and Reisz state. But again the ES seems to have a special status among the traditionalists since they regard it as the spatial support for dramatic relevance. It is taken for granted that the ES has to be shown at some point in the scene; Crittenden is thus implicitly prescribing its use. In a word, these definitions attempt to define the ES as it is practised within a style, what Bordwell has termed as a 'narrative causality system'[31].

Every element then, that is important for the development of the cause-effect logic of the narration should appear in the ES. Subsequently, analytical editing (analytical since it is argued that it analyses the dramatic logic of the scene and chooses those elements that are important for the spectator's understanding of the scene) will show these elements in closer shots. Bordwell writes:

> Space is so rigidly codified by the scene's flow of cause and effect. The character's activity is the fulcrum of the construction of the180° space. The initial establishing shot is followed most probably by two shots (plan americain or medium long shot framings). Then comes a shot-reversed shot or eye line matched medium shots which can alternate for some time in these images will usually keep the figures in the same scale in shot and counter-shot [...] this accentuation of the space follows the flow of cause and effect, the opening, development and choosing of lines of action – when a character changes positions, a broader view must resituate us; when a new character enters, the almost inevitable eye line matches must be reinforced by an eventual establishing shot. The re-establishing shots can in turn anticipate the next cause in the chain.[32]

Bordwell also argues that the aim of the Hollywood style is temporal continuity. This is not a contradiction. In the continuity style the ES provides the spatial continuity, which in turn provides the temporal continuity, which in turn becomes a vehicle for the narrative. At least, this is the principle. But as Bordwell points out, temporal

[30] Ibid, p. 42.
[31] Bordwell, On the History of Film Style, p. 50.
[32] Ibid p. 65.

continuity – which in its narrowest sense means match-on-action cutting – is, and was, rarely used in a film. Temporal continuity then can be removed from the 'equation' and in practice it is the ES alone which ends up supporting the narrative.

The problem here is not whether the ES is shown in a sequence of shots so that the spectator can orientate himself/herself through the dramatic scene, but how the spectator perceives film space or rather, how the spectator creates, re-creates, film space through editing. As Bordwell states, 'theorists are still a long way from fully understanding how the viewer contributes to the creation of classical space.'[33] By 'classical space' Bordwell means film space. Practitioners of the CS on the one hand, and traditional historians, technicians and theorists, on the other, seem to have been (and remain) content with using or abusing the ES to explain how the spectator perceives film space: allegedly the spectator perceives film space simply because it is shown to him/her fully in one shot, the ES. This is not the case. The spectator perceives film space within the ES not by means of the ES, but by means of a series of elements, all contained in the CS. For example, the eye-line match and the tone match contribute much more to spatial continuity than the ES, and narrative logic by itself is a much more determining factor in the creation of film space, let alone of narrative continuity, than the ES. I shall discuss these claims in later chapters.

What surprises one is not only this lack of will on the part of the traditionalists to analyse what film space is but also how every single departure from this rigid system of norms called CS is systematically ignored or at best attacked, as in the case of Dreyer's La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc (1928), even though these departures do not break the spatial continuity championed by the CS. It is precisely this departure from the set of norms which sheds light on the nature of film space and how it is perceived by the spectator. The ES is one of those norms. Traditionalists have undertaken no thorough theoretical analysis of the ES, nor have they provided a valid explanation of its necessity. Nevertheless, the ES is justified as prescriptive and in the technical works (and 'grammars') written during and after the 1950s, the justification for its use gradually disappears and the ES is taken for granted as an essential element of the CS.

Dreyer's La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc was made almost in its entirety without an ES. The film is roughly divided into three parts: the trial; the period in which the court takes its decision and where Joan is waiting in her cell and is at some point

[33] Ibid, p. 55.

tortured; and the execution. The first part starts with a pan from above (from the left to the right of the screen) of the locale where the trial will take place. The judges are seen. This, indeed, could be argued to be an ES. The whole space is seen in one shot. However, Joan is never shown in this pan and her entrance (accompanied by her guards) onto the scene is shown in a medium long shot where there are no topographical references to the previous pan. The background does not give any clues. The rest of the trial session is shown in a series of CUs of Joan, alternated with pans (to right and left of the screen) and CUs of the judges and so on. The eye line matches are here irrelevant to some extent as they are not always respected. The end of the scene shows a long shot of Joan being taken away from the room. This shot is taken from outside the room, from behind the doors. Three-quarters of the long shot shows nothing but the walls in the dark and the only part of the court room which is shown is that which lies within the door frame. This shot, then, is in fact a MS where only Joan and a few guards are seen – there are not enough visual and topographical references to tell the spectator that the judges are behind the walls.

Again most of the scene in the cell is shown through CUs and medium CUs (henceforth MCU). There is again an ES of the cell but only when Jeanne is alone. The scenes in the torture chamber are also shown with no ES. Jeanne faints while she is being tortured. When she is taken back to her cell there is in fact an ES where all the characters are seen together – curiously enough only Joan's back is seen. Later in the film there is a public denunciation of Joan in the main square of the town and no ES is shown. Perhaps here the spectator does not precisely know where Jeanne is within the town square, but I do not believe this fact impoverishes the spectator's understanding of the narration. The exact position of Jeanne in the square is irrelevant to the narration.

There are indeed two more ESs in the film: when Joan receives Holy communion and absolution and when she leaves her cell to be burned. But again, no ES is used for the execution scene. Throughout the film the illusion of space is created: Joan is in the court room confronted by the judges; interrogated by the judges in her cell, and so on. Here the technique is based not so much on reflexive off-screen space, that is, POVs (indeed on the part of the judges) but more on the logic of the images and in the numerous inter-titles of the film which act as the dialogue.

In the silent period Dreyer is perhaps the most extreme example of the silent

period where the ES was not used. But he was not alone. There were other directors before the talkies who occasionally do not use the ES. In Russia Evgenii Bauer has a scene with no ES in The Dying Swan (1916). Later, in the Soviet Union, Kuleshov (Bauer's former set designer in King of Paris) has scenes with no ES in the Extraordinary Adventures of Mr West in the Land of the Bolsheviks (1924); Pudovkin in Mother (1926) and Storm over Asia (1928); Dovzhenko in Earth (1930); Eisentein in Strike (1924); Kosinstev and Trauberg in New Babylon (1929); and Romm has scenes with no ES in Boule de suif (1930). Kuleshov based his experiments on film space and spatial continuity (see Part II), the famous Kuleshov effect(s) precisely on the absence of the ES within a sequence. In the sound period, Hitchcock, who started his career directing silent films, has one scene with no ES in Murder (1930), that of the trial (Rex against Diana Bering). Another director who started his career with silent films and who was probably one of the major contributors to the establishing of the CS in the 1910s, John Ford, occasionally leaves the ES out. In The Quiet Man (1952), the scene in which the horse race takes place has no ES. The scene starts with a sequence in MSs, where the participants are seen, individually, preparing themselves for the race; and villagers making bets and taking their seats. The actual race is shot through the technique of reflexive use of off-screen space: several Mss of the spectators are cut in by long shots (hence LS) of the race. After the race Ford again uses a sequence of MSs where the winner is given the trophy, and different reactions of the main characters are shown. At no point in the scene is the ES used. Likewise in Rio Grande (1950), the scene which takes place in the hospital ward where the commander's son wakes up after his fight with a fellow soldier, is conveyed merely by POV shots. No ES is used.

Robert Bresson frequently leaves the ES out in Le Procès de Jeanne d'Arc (1962) (according to Bordwell, Stager, Thompson, p.58) and occasionally in Mouchette (1967). Visconti has one non-ES scene in Rocco i suoi fratelli (1960); Godard one in Vivre sa vie (1962); and so on. There is no point in listing all the films that occasionally have non-ES scenes but I do wish to state that the non-ES technique is not invented by the Czechoslovak New Wave. Indeed in Czechoslovakia, there are also occasional non-ES scenes, two examples are Vlček's Advent (1956) and Krška's Zde jsou lvi (1959). Later this non-ES technique is systematically employed by the Czechoslovak New Wave.

These films and the theoretical works of Kuleshov, Pudovkin, and Eisentein

(see Part II) demonstrate that the ES is not an essential element in conveying film space and a sense of narrative continuity, and nevertheless the traditionalists revere the use of the ES as prescriptive, ignoring the above examples of the omission of the ES. Traditional texts on the technique of film editing do not analyse Pudovkin's films at all even though they tend to quote his theoretical writings, largely misinterpreting them. Only Reisz makes some general comments on Pudovkin's style. Dovzhenko is mentioned by most works, but no serious attempt is made to analyse his films. As far as Dreyer is concerned, according to the traditionalists he barely existed. Spottiswoode in his Grammar of the Film mentions La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc only in relation to the danger of including in a film book 'stills' which are more beautiful than the text. Dancyger deals with him in one sentence; Crittenden compares him, in a somehow bizarre way to Ozu, and furthermore mistakes the title of Dreyer's film with that of Bresson's under a photograph of the shooting of the latter's film. Traditional film theorists (Arnheim and Mitry) analyse Dreyer, but only to attack him.

Spottiswoode, when defining film space, states that 'a selection of shots taken at points geographically remote from one another may, if they do not contain any means of geographical identification, be combined in a new spatial framework.'[34] There is a clear reference here to Pudovkin's constructive editing, although Spottiswoode later calls it 'relational cutting', and to Kuleshov's experiments, in particular, that of the two people meeting in front of the White House. There is also a clear implication that no ES is necessary: a 'new spatial framework' is created, new, that is, as opposed to real, created from 'geographically remote' shots. That is, no real space is shown in one single shot. However, this is only possible when there is no 'geographical identification', presumably within each single shot, by the spectator. It is not clear what exactly Spottiswoode means by this. He might be implying that Kuleshov's ' White House' sequence works because the spectator does not identify the White House, implying also that, if the spectator indeed identifies the White House, he/she would not perceive the sequence as taking place within the same 'spatial framework'. In other words, Spottiswoode seems to be implying that the spectator does not need the ES in this case because he is unable to identify the shots 'geographically'. He seems to be implying that in this case the spectator is disorientated 'geographically' and thus does not need the ES. That contradicts everything that has been said about

[34] Spottiswoode, R, A Grammar of the Film , London, 1935, p.47 (henceforth Spottiswoode).

the ES. He even contradicts himself since he later states:

> [...] it must be remembered that the pictorical cinema cannot describe relations except within the bounds of a single shot, a combination which is of much importance in giving warning of the danger of close-ups becoming unrelated to one another and of incidents losing the relative position in time which alone can make them intelligible for the spectator.[35]

Here again the CS is taken as the model: one single shot that 'describes the relations', in other words, the ES; incidents with a 'relative position in time', that is the development of the narration within continuity editing, by means of the close shots. Spottiswoode emphatically justifies the use of the ES as the only way of establishing relations, but he makes no attempt to explain it. One wonders why this is the only way to establish relations and why the danger of unrelated CUs exists. These questions are never posed nor answered. The techniques employed by Pudovkin, Dreyer, and Dovzhenko are ignored. Lindgren never mentions the ES explicitly, never imposes its use nor warns us of the dangers of its absence, but nevertheless, it is clear throughout his study that he is referring to the classical Hollywood style.

In Reisz's The Technique of Film Editing, the ES already begins to be taken for granted as a natural element of film language, and by now film language is equated with the classical continuity style. In every example analysed, the ES is found together with the continuity style. For example, when analysing Griffith's technique, he writes: 'In Griffith's continuity [...] the viewpoint is changed not for physical but for dramatic reasons - to show the spectator a fresh detail of the larger scene which has become more relevant to the drama of the particular moment'.[36] When referring to the 'Kuleshov effect'[37] only the semantic aspect of the experiment is analysed (how the juxtaposition of Mozzhukhin's face to a plate of soup conveys the meaning of hunger and so on); the spatial connotations of the experiment are ignored. Again the ES is the only way to 'preserve a clear continuity': 'A sequence which introduces a new locale should start by establishing the topographical relationship between the players and the

[35] Ibid, p.251.
[36] Reisz and Millar, p.22.
[37] Ibid, p.30.

background.'[38] He claims that there are many exceptions to this rule but the only one he mentions is that the ES can be shown at the end of the sequence instead of at the beginning. And in this case, 'even when a sequence starts on a detail it is important that the whole setting should be shown at some stage.'[39] He continues by stating that a big CU should always be shown together with an ES. Thus there seems to be no exception to the rule of using the ES. Furthermore, no explanation is given for this utter necessity of using the ES. Dancyger starts his study by almost equating editing with continuity.[40] A film is edited to 'present a narrative continuity'. To a certain extent this is indeed true. But Dancyger's continuity is achieved solely through the ES: 'An establishing shot of the location sets the context for the scene and provides a point of reference for the close-ups'.[41] No other way of preserving continuity is mentioned. The ES is not questioned, nor analysed. Editing is continuity. Continuity is the ES. Editing is the ES. At this stage in the history of film grammars editing is unthinkable without the ES. It is likewise with Crittenden. Only the continuity style is analysed. The ES is prescriptive: 'Once the position is established every subsequent shot that is incorporated must refer to the axis of this establishing shot.'.[42] And: 'Even if we take a close-up of one of the characters from exactly in front, the angle of the head or the look of the eyes must match that established in the wider shot.'.[43] No other alternatives exist for the traditionalists, to the point that Arijon states that there are only three types of editing:

1. A master shot registers the whole scene.
2. A master shot is intercut with other shorter takes.
3. Two or more master shots are blended together in parallel.[44]

In all three types of editing, the ES (master shot) is used, and not questioned. In Arijon's grammar all 600 pages of examples make use of the ES.

The only reason these film grammars provide of the necessity of the ES is that it constitutes the only way to build narrative continuity. But this is not explained. Perhaps the closest the grammars come to explaining the prescriptive ES is their use

[38] Ibid, p. 225.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Dancyger, p.xviii.
[41] Ibid, p. 302.
[42] Crittenden, p. 4.
[43] Ibid, p. 42.
[44] Arijon, p. 17.

of the concept of 'natural attention' (and not all employ it), for example:

> Analytical editing, Hollywood commentators tell us, follows the 'natural attention' of the spectator. First, the onlooker surveys the scene (establishing shot); as the action continues, he or she focuses upon a detail (cut in), or glances back and forth at the participants in the conversation (shot-reverse-shot) or glances to the side when distracted by a sound or motion.[45]

This idea of natural attention is already present in Pudovkin's theoretical writing:'When we wish to apprehend anything, we always begin with the general outlines, and then, by intensifying our examination to the highest degree, enrich the apprehension by an ever-increasing number of details.'[46] Unlike the Hollywood 'commentators', Pudovkin makes use of this idea in more abstract terms, and in practice this is not translated literally in his editing. In other words, the 'general outline' is not regarded necessarily as an ES, and the details are not necessarily the CUs. However, Lindgren takes the concept 'natural attention' (most probably from Pudovkin) and uses it to justify editing psychologically: 'The fundamental psychological justification of editing as a method representing the physical world around us lies in the fact that it reproduces this mental process in which one visual image follows another as our attention is drawn to this point and to that in our surrounding.'[47] Reisz questions this statement by stating, first, that the angle and position of the camera are different in each shot and therefore it is not so natural for the spectator to move so fast from one point to the other. He concludes that editing 'interprets' the mental process of attention.[48] He also points out, quite rightly, that editing does not follow the 'natural attention' of the spectator, but on the contrary, that it guides this attention[49], as Thompson had already pointed out.[50] Nevertheless this 'interpretation' of the 'natural attention' of the spectator to which Reisz makes reference seems to have remained the main 'theoretical' justification behind the use of the ES – a justification in which the 'general outline' is equated in a narrow way to

---

[45] Bordwell, Stager, Thompson, p.202.
[46] Pudovkin, V, Film Technique, London, 1933, pp. 62-63.
[47] Lindgren, p.55.
[48] Reisz and Millar, pp.214-215.
[49] Ibid, p.215.
[50] Bordwell, Stager, Thompson, p. 214: 'While the classical cinema claims to follow the attention of the spectator it actually guides that attention carefully by establishing expectation about what spatial configurations are likely to occur.'

the ES.

This way of explaining film space and the use of the ES through the idea of 'natural attention' forms part of a broader conception. As William K. Everson states there 'was the traditional view of the classical cinema as a teleological growth towards a natural film grammar waiting to be discovered.'[51] Since the classical film language, the CS, is considered to be natural, it is not questioned nor are the causes leading to its origin, development, and establishment; nor a re the elements of the 'natural film grammar' questioned. Furthermore, every 'discovery' must have been 'discovered' by a 'discoverer'. And in this case he is no other than D.W. Griffith, whose status is likewise not questioned. Griffith's films are regarded by the traditionalists as the paradigm of the CS. And this is not the case (see below).

Unlike the grammarians these theorists do not ignore Dreyer's La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc. For example, Rudolf Arnheim, in his Film as Art, attacks it. For Arnheim, a scene shot without an ES is not understood by the spectator. When analysing the nature and possibilities of the CU he warns the reader of its inherent dangers:

> The close-up however, has one serious drawback. It easily leaves the spectator in the dark as to the surroundings of the object or part of the object. This is especially true in a film where there are too many close-ups, where hardly any long shots are given, or for instance in Dreyer's The Passion of Joan of Arc, or in a number of Russian films. The close-up shows a human head, but one cannot tell where the man is to whom the head belongs, whether he is indoors or outdoors, and how is he placed in regard to other people – whether close or

[51] Ibid, p.157. See also Burch, N, Life to Those Shadows, London, 1990, p.2 : 'This book was intended above all as a critique of theoretical and historical discourses tending to naturalise the "Hollywood" system of representation.' A similar teleological explanation can be found in Aristotle's Poetics regarding tragedy: 'Tragedy was gradually enhanced as poets made progress with the potential which they could see in the genre. And when it had gone through many changes, tragedy ceased to evolve, since it had attained its natural fulfillment' (Aristotle, The Poetics of Aristotle, translated by Stephen Halliwell, London, 1987, p.35). Other translations have instead of 'natural fulfillment', 'natural form' (for example W. Hamilton Fyfe's translation, Aristotle, The Poetics, London, 1927,p.16, in Gombrich, Norm and Form, 4th edn. London, 1985, p. 75). See also, Wellek, Rene, Concepts of Criticism, New Haven, London, 1963, p. 38. Perhaps this view on tragedy influenced the 'traditionalists' in their teleological interpretation of film editing, that is, to film form. Perhaps again the 'traditionalists' interpretation of the discovery of the natural film language reflects 'the main historiographic pattern which classical antiquity bequeathed to the Western tradition [...] that of progress towards an ideal of perfection. The advantage of this pattern in giving coherence to the history of any art was demonstrated by Aristotle for the story of Greek tragedy, by Cicero for the rise of oratory and, of course, by Pliny for the rise of painting and sculpture.[...]It lies in the nature of this conception of the gradual unfolding of an ideal that it must come to a stop once perfection is reached'. Gombrich, Norm and Form, p. 100. In cinema this stop according to the traditionalists is Griffith.

> distant, turning towards them or away from them, in the same room with them or somewhere else. A superabundance of close-ups very easily leads to the spectators having a tiresome sense of uncertainty and dislocation. Thus a film artist will generally find himself obliged not to use close-ups alone but only in conjunction with long shots that will give the necessary information as to the situation in general.[52]

Arnheim's criticism of Dreyer's film seems to rely more on personal opinions than to have a serious theoretical basis. He does not give a reason, theoretical or technical, why the spectator is 'left in the dark'. He merely states that a spectator needs to see the rest of the body of a character, the whole room, how many metres separate the characters from each other and so on, in order first to understand the space where the scene is taking place and secondly the narration – in order not to be tiresomely dislocated. Furthermore he states that the ES is an 'obligation'. Once again film space is solved by the use of the ES. This criticism of Dreyer's film is not based on a theoretical analysis of the film, but on the continuity style and on the assumption that this style is the natural language of the medium.

This can be seen more clearly in his detailed 'scheme of montage classifications', drawn under the heading of 'Principles of Montage'[53], which is based on both Pudovkin's and Timoshenko's schemes. In section I, 'Principles of Cutting', point A, he classifies the different lengths of the shots: there are, according to Arnheim, long strips and short strips of film. These lengths can be combined into short and long strips, sometimes in an irregular way ('series of strips of variable length neither definitely short nor long. The length dependent on the contents') Be that as it may, there seems to be only one style of editing an individual scene and that is using the ES. In section I, point C1, he describes the classical Hollywood style a 'combination of long shots and close-ups'. And he states: 'by long shot [...] is to be understood one which puts the subject of the close-up in a wider content.' In other words, the ES. This combination can include the LS at the beginning, section I, point C1a or at the end, section I, point C1b, is always careful to include the preceding detail in the subsequent LS; or again an 'irregular' combination of LSs and details, section I, point C1c. However in section I, point C2 no LS is included, it is only made up of a succession of

[52] Arnheim, R, Film as Art, Berkeley, CA, 1957, p.82. Originally published as Film, London, 1933.
[53] Ibid, pp.94-98.

detail shots. Arnheim argues that this is Timoshenko's 'analytical montage'. So it looks as if Arnheim allows a scene to be edited without an ES. But this is not so. When referring to 'Time Relations', section II of the scheme, he refers to Timoshenko's analytical montage as unusable. Categorically unusable. Section II, point A2: '[Synchronism] of details of a setting of action at the same moment of time. (Successive showing of events taking place at the same time in the same room. The man is here, the woman there, etc.) (Timoshenko's "analytical montage". Unusable.'[54]

Timoshenko's analytical montage seems to be included for a third time, now under, 'Space Relations', section III. Section III, point B is headed as 'The place changed'. When this change takes place within one scene, section III, point B2, Arnheim states: 'different partial views of the place of action'. This point is strikingly similar to section II, point A2 but this time no judgement is added. Arnheim might mean that section II, point B2 is usable, due to its spatial and not temporal character like section II, point A2. Likewise it is not clear whether or not section I, point C2 is usable. This scheme rather than being a serious attempt to analyse the principles of editing, seems to be merely a codification of the norms found in the dominant continuity style.

In his monumental study, Aesthetics and Psychology of Film, Jean Mitry, the other main traditional film theorist, on the other hand, claims that he does not want to create laws, since these merely cover styles. He criticizes those previous film theories based on editing; he claims that these create, from possible styles fundamentals of general aesthetics. He will simply attempt to analyse the structures and forms of a language, in this case, film language. His study is indeed exhaustive and ranges widely, from volume I, chapter I, where he analyses the origins of art, to several chapters dedicated to the study of those arts which have influenced cinema: theatre, painting, music. In volume I, chapter 3 he analyses whether film is a language or not. He claims that film is a system of images not to be confused with a verbal language. In volume I, chapter 4 he makes an exhaustive study of the differences between the image and the word, to concentrate in the following chapter on the image itself, and so on.

He states at the beginning of volume I that a treatise on aesthetics should not be a collection of practical recipes and at the beginning of volume II, defending himself

[54] Ibid, pp.95-96. For Timoshenko's scheme see Timoshenko, S, Iskusstvo kino, montazu filma, Leningrad, 1926.

from his critics, he attacks the continuity style found in American and French films where a scene always starts with a general view (ES) followed by details.[55] He describes this style as the 'industrial method' and as a 'culinary recipe', and he adds that recipes are not to be mistaken for basic principles. He describes what he claims are all possible alternatives to the continuity style, which, however, according to Mitry, narrow down to the use of depth of field composition and techniques. In other words, the only examples found in his 'brief' history of alternative editing (volume II, pp. 17-22) are the films of Renoir, Wyler and Welles, examples which however, he claims follow the same basic principles as the CS. He finally claims that rules cannot become laws, that artistic rules cannot be prescriptive. Answering his critics, he claims that for him editing is merely a matter of giving a sequence of shots a premeditated intention, inserting each shot into a continuity. Unfortunately, throughout the two volumes he only analyses closely examples of the continuity style. Every time he 'steps down' from his scholarly high theories to a more practical level, the continuity style with its ES is either referred to or implied. Furthermore, he constantly attacks Bazin for defending a style without cutting and, on the other hand, attacks Eisenstein, and his fellow Soviet directors, for practising a style of editing which distorts reality. So at the end, contradictorily, the reader has the impression that there is only one style of editing – at least only one that is allowed, the CS.

Furthermore, even though Mitry acknowledges the difference between real space and film space, and even though several chapters are dedicated to space, surprisingly the study makes no attempt at defining film space and how is it perceived by the spectator. Again, the answer seems to be simple: the spectator perceives film space through the ES. In volume I, chapter 6, 'Structures of the images', in the section dedicated to types of shots and angles Mitry seems to have the continuity style in mind. When defining what a SRS is he describes the classical SRS examples, starting with an ES followed by MSs which include both characters, for example, taking part in a conversation: first, character A is in the background focused while character B is in the foreground out of focus, and so on. There is nothing wrong with this, but he then argues that each character may be shown isolated from the other; he adds, however, 'in this case the spatial establishment is lost'.[56] He does not specify why. He then mentions the deep-focus technique, perhaps as an alternative to classical editing,

[55] Mitry, J, Estetica y psicologia del cine, 2 vols, Madrid, 1978 (originally published as Esthetique et psychologie du cinema, 2 vols, Paris, 1963), vol. II, p. 16.
[56] Ibid. vol. I, p. 174.

but he argues that the principles of editing remain the same, stating that these are 'unmodifiable'.[57] Again he does not say why. Mitry begins to be prescriptive. He continues his analyses of the structures of the image by saying that what is important in a film is its sense of continuity and that editing is the tool that creates this continuity. True to the tradition, Mitry believes that Porter and Griffith discovered this continuity, and moreover, he states that film as art was born in 1915 with Griffith's Birth of a Nation.[58] This chapter seems to contradict the aim of the work as set out by Mitry in the first chapter, that is, not to mistake recipes for principles. This adherence to the classical CS is more striking in volume I, chapter 8, dedicated to editing. The first part recounts the traditional history of editing with the emphasis placed on Griffith – the techniques of the Brighton School are described but it was only Porter and above all Griffith who gave sense to these techniques. Griffith was the inventor, the creator of the syntax of film language.[59]

In his analysis of the dynamic relation between shots no reference is made to space. There are four dynamic relations between shots: scale relations (where again the example given has an ES); intensity relations (where the example given has an ES); plastic relations; and relations of angle and frame. Not much thought is devoted to spatial relations, perhaps because the ES is taken for granted as the natural and only way of conveying film space.

In this chapter there is a detailed analysis of the Kuleshov effect. Mitry believes that this experiment made film an art of suggestion: an idea is suggested to the spectator; the idea is not created by the effect, but the effect forces the spectator to recall an experience already lived. The effect is analysed in terms of meaning only. Mitry concludes that the process achieved through the effect 'although visual, is anti-cinematographic as it goes from the idea to the notion instead of the other way round'.[60] It is difficult to see what he means by this statement but be that as it may, the spatial aspect of the Kuleshov effect is entirely ignored, perhaps not even noticed. In volume I, chapter 10 in his study of cinematographic rhythm he is aware of the spatial juxtaposition of shots in Pudovkin's and Eisenstein's films, but he does not develop his awareness of it. In the section entitled 'Psychology of Editing', he launches his main attack on Bazin's ideas. Bazin with his emphasis on uncut sequences believed

[57] Ibid, p.177.
[58] Ibid, p.178-182.
[59] Ibid, p.326.
[60] Ibid, p. 335.

that in this way the spatial unity of the action was preserved, that is, the real spatial unity of the action as it takes place. Mitry answers him by saying that 'the fact that the spatial unity must be respected has never been ignored by anybody. Any worthwhile filmmaker when having to represent a concrete reality has proceeded as Bazin says, whatever the fragmentation the filmmaker thought he should apply to reality.'[61] He continues by giving an example from Pudovkin's Mother in which an ES is used. This makes one wonder what Mitry understands, first, by reality or rather by film reality, and secondly, by spatial unity. Throughout the two volumes, Mitry's ideas on reality and on how should reality be represented in cinema are contradictory and difficult to understand, but from the example he chooses from Mother it is clear that by spatial unity he understands 'ES'. Furthermore, he never mentions that Pudovkin occasionally makes no use of the ES, nor does he discuss Pudovkin's theoretical writings. To make matters even more confusing Mitry argues that when no ES is used, the scene 'loses all contact with reality'.[62] And he goes on to say that if an ES is used the scene can subsequently be broken down into details since 'the spatial relation created by the editing automatically relates in our spirit with the previously captured reality'. On the other hand if no ES is used then the 'mental representation would be the imaginary result of relations which have not been objectified'.[63] Something which becomes 'pseudoreal, half objective and half subjective'. It is difficult to understand what he is trying to say at this point but apparently the spectator looses all contact with what is real. Furthermore Mitry seems to imply that there are only two ways of shooting a scene: with the ES at the beginning, or at the end. If the latter is the case Mitry argues that it creates uncertainty in the spectator because the relations are, until the ES appears, merely theoretical. This is caused by the ' absence of spatial references'.[64]

La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc is mentioned briefly in relation to tracking movements on page 37(vol. I); to oblique angles on page 92 (vol. I); and on the need for sound on page 104 (vol. I). On page 239 (vol. I) , Mitry states that this film contains a reduction of space.

He argues that the number of CUs where Joan is isolated from other characters is few, and when critics pointed out to him that he was mistaken, in a note to the

[61] Ibid, p. 465.
[62] Ibid, p. 467.
[63] Ibid.
[64] Ibid, p.466.

second edition, he argues that these CUs serve only the star's coquetry. He claims that the CUs have no aesthetic purpose in Dreyer's film.[65] In the second volume, written several years later, he states that Dreyer's style is legitimate, but only in exceptional cases.[66]

In Mitry's treatise there are 'no' rules nor laws. But there seems to be only one style, the style Mitry likes (and understands).This seems to be the trend in traditional technical works on film editing and theories, a subjective understanding of film language where film space has not been fully analysed, nor perhaps understood; where all arbitrary theoretical justifications are made to accommodate a convention and where all divergences from that convention are either ignored or attacked.

REVISIONIST SCHOLARSHIP. THE DENATURALISATION OF THE CONTINUITY STYLE.

The CS, then, is not the 'natural' language of cinema, but a style that became dominant after a long process of experimentation of twenty or so years. At the beginning of this period there was no clear style but just filmmakers trying to understand the medium and experimenting with the aesthetic possibilities of the new art. They incorporated traditions from other arts and experimented them within the emerging (major) film genres: cinema of attractions, cinema of actualities, narrative cinema. Within each genre different experimentation was carried out. Later, once narrative cinema became the dominant genre, different styles within the genre emerged on each side of the Atlantic, to the extent that there was, for a time, an American style and a European style of 'continuous narration'. They coexisted and influenced each other. One probable reason why the CS became the dominant style was the economic factor. The CS was the style championed by Hollywood. The establishment of the CS as the dominant style paralleled the establishment of Hollywood as the world's most powerful film industry. This thesis is not the place to discuss the reasons why the CS became the dominant style; nevertheless it is important to analyse the aesthetic processes taking place in cinema during the first twenty years of its existence in order to demonstrate the validity of other experiments,

[65] Ibid. pp. 491-492.
[66] Ibid, vol. II, p. 526.

those other aesthetic options with which other styles were being developed, before the CS became the dominant style. The CS was not the 'natural' language but a style which developed from specific 'Western' traditions, which, if different, would have created a different 'natural' language. For example the Japanese cinema with its different artistic traditions developed a different style until it westernised , gradually succumbing to the dominant CS .[67]

The 'denaturalisation' of the CS has been the result of research started in the late 1970s, what Bordwell has come to call 'revisionist scholarship'.[68] These revisionist scholars of early cinema gathered for the first time at the 1978 FIAF Conference held in Brighton[69], and then later at Pordenone, Italy, at the annual 'Giornate del cinema muto', where in 1985 they founded DOMITOR (International Association for the Study of Silent Cinema).[70]

Research carried out by the revisionists shed some light on how early filmmakers experimented, consciously or unconsciously, with spatial and narrative elements derived from other arts. The revisionists were doing research into how early filmmakers were experimenting in conveying a narrative spatially, a continuum conveyed to the spectator by means of space. The traditional views had it that theatre was the main influence on early cinema and that it was editing, in particular that employed by Griffith, that liberated cinema from theatre. Indeed, theatre had a significant influence on cinema, in particular, according to Andre Bazin,[71] nineteenth century 'bourgeois' theatre, resulting in the frontality and the flatness of the shots and also in the size of the frame which attempted to recreate the objective point of view of an observer sitting in a fixed position in the stalls of a theatre. Likewise the sense of screen direction was 'inherited' from the theatre.[72] The LS, then, was the translation to cinema of the theatrical proscenium (later resulting in the ES and the axis rule), and the long take (with a fixed camera) being the equivalent of the theatrical scene.[73] The revisionists argue that there were other influences behind this frontality and flatness. Thompson and Burch have suggested that another important influence was that of the

---

[67] For an analysis of Japanese cinema see Burch, Nöel, To the Distant Observer, London, 1971.
[68] Bordwell, On the History of Film Style, p.129.
[69] Elsaesser, Thomas, (ed.), Early Cinema: Space, Frame, Narrative, London, 1990, p.2 (henceforth Elsaesser).
[70] Bordwell, On the History of Film Style, p.129.
[71] Andre Bazin, in ibid. p.56.
[72] Bordwell, Stager, Thompson, p.202.
[73] Gunning 'Primitive Cinema. A Frame up? Or the Trick's On Us? in Elsaesser, p.97.

tableau vivant.[74] Bordwell suggests that this frontality was brought about by the aim of filmmakers to present the narrative facing the spectator. This was derived mainly from Renaissance and post-Renaissance painting, which in turn derived from the 'idea of narrative action address to the spectator' found in Greek and Roman stenography.[75] Frontality was also found in magic lantern slides and in 'related projected illusions'.[76] Magic lantern shows had also an important influence in the framing and in the resulting chosen distant view point.[77] Gunning also draws attention to the stereoscope card comic strips and postcards of the nineteenth century and Bordwell again to Renaissance painting for framing and composition.[78] From these 'revisionist' conclusions one might speculate that the ES is in the CS not a spatial necessity for the purpose of the spectator's orientation within the narrative but an residual element derived from the theatre and Western painting and popular arts. Frontality was gradually abandoned in the search for a sense of three-dimensionality, a search which is also found in Renaissance perspective and in the theatre). This was carried out by combining experiments with staging in depth and with sequences which contained different points of view, that is by editing. Regarding perspective, most of the influence came from Renaissance art. This influence came mainly through photography.[79] Most of the filmmakers of the Brighton School were originally photographers. Different viewpoints and framings can be seen in late nineteenth century photography, comic strips (in particular Gustave Dore's illustrated L'Histoire de la sainte Russie, Paris, 1894) and magic lantern sequences.[80] Comic strips and magic lantern shows also provided with precedents in spatial continuity.[81] But according to Salt, magic lantern sequences did not actually provide the spatial continuity visually but by means of an accompanied recited text: 'most of these lantern slide sequences showed what were essentially discovered scenes and they relied on their accompanying text which was recited by the showman, to provide a continuous narrative thread. For instance, in one of the most famous sequences Bob the Fireman, the principal figure in successive slides is obviously a different man, but

[74] Bordwell, Stager, Thompson, p.194 and Burch, Life to Those Shadows, p.19.
[75] Bordwell, Stager, Thompson, p. 51
[76] Charles Musser in Elsaesser, p. 97. See also Burch, Life to those Shadows, 89.
[77] Gunning in Elsaesser, p. 100.
[78] Ibid. See also Bordwell, Stager, Thompson, p.50.
[79] Ibid. and Burch, Life to those Shadows, p.89 and Salt, Barry, Film Style and Technology: History and Analysis, London, 1983, p.51.
[80] Fairservice, Don, Film Editing. History, Theory, and Practice, Manchester, New York,2001, p.14 (henceforth).
[81] Vaughan, Dai, 'Let there be Lumiere', in Elsaesser, p 63, and Salt, Film Style and Technology, p. 51.

the text always insists that he is "Bob".'[82] Elements of this discontinuity can be seen in E.S. Porter's Life of a Fireman (1902).[83] Burch and Salt further suggest that the Brighton School, in particular, G.A. Smith's films were strongly influenced by magic lantern techniques in narrative and framing.[84] There are two issues here. First, the implementation in cinema of techniques found in other arts and other popular entertainments, and secondly, an experimentation with and development of these techniques by the filmmakers. It is in this process that the need for editing emerges. The question is why. Research suggests that it is the search for three-dimensionality that brings about the implementation of editing techniques, but mainly in European cinema this search was carried out not by editing but by staging in depth. Research, both traditional and revisionist, also suggests that it was the development of film narratives that demanded new ways of conveying narratives that were becoming more and more complex. Different camera positions and framings were used for dramatic and narrative purposes, moving away from a purely objective narration towards a more subjective one, as Fairservice suggests.[85] Stephen Bottomore, though, suggests that editing as such emerges in the films of 'actuality', that is, footage of real events. According to Bottomore films of actuality were already being edited by 1897.[86] The first fiction film to be edited, that is, to have more than one shot, to be a multi-shot narration dates from 1899 and soon they were widely established.[87] By 1901 narrative films were the dominant genre although Gunning argues that the difference between actualities and fiction films was not clear, since both shared the same purpose, that of showing what Gunning calls as 'attractions'. Indeed, Gunning argues that the use of editing techniques in early cinema had no narrative purpose but rather one of merely showing. For example, the CU is not a 'narrative punctuation' but 'an attraction in its own right'.[88]

All revisionists agree that the members of what would later be called the Brighton School were pioneers in implementing editing techniques for narrative purposes, in particular Smith. His is the first example of editing to have survived in fiction film. Smith already experimented with multi-shot films in 1899 with Henley's

[82] Salt, Film Style and Technology, p.51.
[83] Ibid. See also Bordwell, On the History of Film Style, p.129.
[84] Burch, Life to Those Shadows, p. 89 and Salt, Barry, 'Film Form 1900-1906' in Elsaesser, p.33.
[85] Fairservice, pp.14 and 109.
[86] Bottomore, Stephen, 'Shots in the Dark. The real Origin of Film Editing', in Elsaesser, p.104.
[87] Fairservice, p. 18.
[88] Gunning, Tom, 'Cinema of Attractions. Early Film, Its Spectator and the Avant Garde', in Elsaesser, p.58.

Regatta, co-directed by James A. Williamson (also a Brightoner). Smith and Williamson edited the film with causal logic in mind: 'shots of boats taken from the river bank are intercut with shots of crowds waving, obviously filmed from mid-river.'[89] Smith then develops this causal editing in his more narrative films. Smith is credited by revisionists with being the first film director to divide a scene into several shots and the first also to make use of POV shots. In 1899 Smith shot The Kiss in the Tunnel and Let Me Dream Again, both two-shot films. The former cuts from a tracking shot take from a train, to a long frontal shot of the interior of one of the train's compartments, showing a young lady and a man sitting opposite each other.[90] It is a simple attempt at spatial and narrative continuity. The compartment seen in the second shot is part of one of the carriages of the train seen in the first shot. In the latter film, the first shot shows a man a woman embracing. The second shot (the transition between the two shots is done with an in/out of focus) the same man wakes up in bed with his wife (not the same woman as in the first shot).[91] Again the link between the shots is causal (the in/out of focus is there to reinforce the sense of dreaming): the man was dreaming that he was having an affair with a younger woman. Smith develops this causality further in Grandma's Reading Glass (1900). In this film Smith dissects a scene (the only scene of the film) into several shots. These shots have a direct temporal and spatial continuity. A boy is playing with his grandmother's reading glass. A LS of him as he looks through the glass is intercut with big CUs of the objects he is observing, through the reading glass. In other words, Smith is using for the first time POV shots.[92] Smith is experimenting with a subjective mode of narration. He is narrating from the character's point of view. Smith further develops the POV technique in As Seen Through the Telescope (1900) and in scenes in Every Floor (1902). This technique also contained the principle of transition between shots of different sizes. Smith develops the transition from LS to CU in the sense of positioning matching in The Little Doctor (1901), later reissued in 1903 as The Sick Kitten. In the LS some children are seen feeding a kitten. Smith then cuts to a CU of the kitten being fed with a spoon. The position match is not exact, as Salt indicates,[93] but the principle is there and the form also: transition from ES to CU. Salt states that

[89] Elsaesser, 'Early Film Form', in Elsaesser, p.12.
[90] Fairservice, p.12.
[91] Ibid. p. 21.
[92] Ibid. and Salt, Film Style and Technology, p.60. Also Salt in Elsaesser, p. 36.
[93] Salt in Elsaesser, p.37.

Smith was basing this editing and narrative technique on lantern slide sequences. [94] E.S. Porter, one of the 'heroes' of the traditionalists, started to employ these techniques in 1903 with Gay Shoe Clerk (LS of the shoe clerk trying shoes on female clients, CU of what he sees: legs).[95] Smith also experimented with action matching as early as 1901 in Masques and Grimaces.[96] Other Brightoners were also experimenting and developing editing techniques which would later become elements of the CS. Williamson in his first version of Attack on a China Mission - Blue Jackets on the Rescue (1900) experimented with perspective and depth of field within the frame by staging the movement of actors obliquely. He also experimented with exits and entrances in/out of frame, thus making use of off-screen space.[97] In the 1903 version of the film Williamson experimented with SRS techniques.[98] William Hagar also experimented with SRS sequences in Desperate Poach Affray (1903).[99] Williamson pioneered a type of spatial continuity in The Dear Boys Home from the Holidays (1903) 'which prefigures Griffithian topography'.[100] It was not then Porter who invented all the editing techniques nor its narrative applications as traditionalists claim, but rather he made use and developed what was being already done in Brighton. The fact is that Porter's The Great Train Robbery (1903) was 'so influential that previous experiments in editing were ignored or rediscovered later'.[101] Indeed, the Brighton filmmakers gradually disappeared from the map. The appearance of Porter and the 'disappearance' of the Brighton filmmakers marks the beginning of the two alternatives in the search for three-dimensionality and techniques for conveying the narrative to the spectator, the European and the American styles. The latter, with Porter as its chief exponent has as its main characteristics fast cutting and shallow staging, the former, with the French as its foremost champions, slow cutting and staging in depth,[102] with the exception of the Danes who seemed to pick up where the Brighton filmmakers had left it. In 1903 with The Execution (Henrettelsen) Peter Effelt started to experiment with off-screen space in a similar way to the SRS experiments of Hagar and Williamson. In this film 'gestures are made to people

[94] Ibid. p. 33.
[95] Salt, Film Style and Technology, p. 60.
[96] Burch, Life to Those Shadows, p.96.
[97] Fairservice, p.24.
[98] Burch Life to Those Shadows, p.92.
[99] Ibid. p.102.
[100] Ibid. p.92.
[101] Fairservice, p.42.
[102] Elsaesser 'Early Film Form', in Elsaesser p.12. For French cinema see Brewster, Ben, 'Deep Staging in French Films 1900-1914', in Elsaesser.

outside the limits of the shot, and entrances and exits relate to action taking place both on and off the screen'.[103] The employment and awareness of off-screen space again have precedents in painting. During the Renaissance it was common practice for married couples to commission 'companion' portraits. Each spouse would have a separate portrait; that is each spouse would be painted within a different frame. In one portrait the spouse would have his/her gaze looking off-screen space in one direction (for example, right) while the other would have it in the opposite direction (that is, left). The portraits would be then hung next to each other, giving the impression that the spouses were lovingly (or not) looking at each other. This is the case of Portrait of Young Lady (1561) by Nicolas de Neufchatel (National Gallery, London). Although this is the only surviving portrait of the two, 'her glance suggests that a companion portrait of her husband may have existed'.[104] The question is whether this Renaissance technique of using off-frame space influenced in any way the development of the SRS film technique and related use of off-screen space. Be that as it may, the Danes continued to explore the nature of film space. For example, Lion Hunting (Løvejagten) (1907) directed by Ole Olsen, creates, for the first time, according to Fairservice, an artificial geography anticipating Kuleshov's famous experiments.[105] By 1911, the Danes had developed a style of editing which could be considered modern, with continuity of action, shot and edited with several camera positions and angles, and different frame sizes, an example of which is the film The Four Devils (De fire djoevle) (1911), directed by Robert Dinesen and Alfred Lind.[106]

The CS gradually emerges when all these editing techniques, all these experiments, come together, creating a 'new conception of story telling',[107] a new use of film space. This process started at the end of the first decade of the twentieth century. The revisionists differ on the dates. Thompson argues that the CS started to emerge between 1907 and 1911, and by 1917 the CS is complete (in America). Bordwell suggests 1909 as the starting date, but then he believes that the process continued until 1920 (in America), although he agrees with Thompson that by 1917 the CS is institutionalised. It gradually replaces the European non-editing style, and by 1930 the replacement is complete. Burch, who argues the CS (he refers to it as the Institutionalised Mode of Representation, IMR) substituted the PMR (Primitive Mode

[103] Fairservice, p.73.
[104] National Gallery, London.
[105] Fairservice, p.81.
[106] Ibid. p.74.
[107] Thompson in Bordwell, On the History of Film Style, p. 132.

of Representation), suggests that the PMR started to change around 1908, or 1909, and the IMR made its appearance in 1909. Salt suggests that the development of the CS takes place between 1909 and 1913, consolidating between 1914 and 1919. By 1919 it is widely used in America but not in Europe, which starts to adopt the style between 1920 and 1926. During this time in Europe still half the eye-line matches are 'wrong'. For Fairservice the foundation of the CS takes place somewhat later, between 1913 and 1916. On the other hand, he argues that the Italians contributed as much to the CS as the Americans. For Gunning though, the key date is 1908. It is in this year that the American directors start to 'redefine films as psychological narratives and assigning fresh functions to devices earlier exploited as attractions'.[108]

Within this process the revisionists regard Griffith as a transitional figure rather than as a major exponent of the CS. This is because Griffith seemed to have employed many of the CS norms 'wrongly'. For example, Griffith 'had a penchant for an ambivalent form of cross-cutting. A character stands in one spot looking in a specific direction. Then Griffith cuts to another character far away, also in a static pose [...]Griffith seems to have believed that this device signalled that A is thinking of B [...] In any case this "ruminative" eyeline cut, as Joyce Jesmiowski calls it, did not become normalized within the mainstream Hollywood style.'[109] Furthermore, when it comes to proper eye-line matches, as employed within the CS, Griffith does not seem to get it 'right'. For example, Burch argues that in the Lonedale Operator (1911), Griffith has only one 'correct' eye line match.[110] The CS was developing the sense of three-dimensionality but Griffith was still keeping the frontality of the image.[111] Griffith used little or no scene dissection[112] and rarely used POV shots nor SRS sequences; that is, he was not making use of the subjective structure characteristic of the emerging CS.[113] This is not to say that Griffith got many of the CS elements 'wrong', but these errors rather indicate something quite the opposite, that Griffith had different aesthetic aims from those of the CS. That is, Griffith seemed to be developing a different style to that of the CS. He was developing a much more objective style, one where the authorial presence would be much more marked ,

---

[108] Bordwell, Stager, Thompson, pp. 157 and following; Bordwell, On the History of Film Style, Chapter 5; Burch Life To Those Shadows, p. 132; Salt, Film Style and Technology, pp 83 and 162; Fairservice, p.72; Gunning in Bordwell, On the History of Film Style, p. 126.
[109] Bordwell, On the History of Film Style, p.131.
[110] Bordwell, On the History of Film Style, p.131.
[111] Elsaesser in Elsaesser, p. 294. Also Fairservice, p. 109.
[112] Elsaesser in Elsaesser, p. 294. Also Salt, Film Style and Technology, p. 162.
[113] Elsaesser in Elsaesser, p.294. Also Fairservice, p. 134.

perhaps it was an attempt to translate to the screen the style of Dickens, whom Griffith so greatly admired. What Griffith did develop more than anybody else , regarding CS elements, were parallel editing and cross cutting, to the extent that he was even attempting 'ruminative' cross cutting, as seen above. Why then was he regarded as the father of the CS by the traditionalists? Perhaps the answer lies in the fact that he was almost the only around for the traditionalists. Barry Salt estimates that of the films shot between 1907 and 1913 only about 1000 survive. Of these 457 were directed by Griffith.[114] In addition, Griffith had quite a talent for self publicity and the marketing of his films. Griffith, once he had independence, that is, once he had his own production company, sold himself (and his films) as the greatest filmmaker of all time.

The leading figures in the development of the CS were others, and most revisionists agree in their names. Burch suggests the CS should be mainly attributed to Thomas and Ralph Ince (the former more in the position of producer, rather than director, although he also directed films), Cecil B. DeMille, and Reginald Baker (director of some of the films produced by Thomas Ince, but rarely credited as such - Thomas Ince credited himself as director.) Ralph Ince, DeMille and Baker were responsible in large part for developing direction matches and eye line matches.[115] Bordwell adds two more names to the list. He gives as examples of the CS, Raoul Walsh's Regeneration (1915), Maurice Tourneurs' The Wishing Ring (date unknown), Alias Jimmy Valentine (date unknown), and DeMille's The Cheat (1915).[116] For Salt, Ralph Ince and Barker were the leading figures in developing reverse angle cutting, and Ralph Ince was also responsible for the match on action.[117] Fairservice also argues that the influence of Italian film at the time, in particular, Cabiria (1914) directed by Giovanni Pastrone., was important in developing the CS. Cabiria has scene dissection with 'elaborate angle changes and fragmentation of action presenting an entire scene as the sum of its parts.[118] Fairservice also credits Ralph Ince with being the main figure in the development of the SRS sequence and the pace of rhythm in the editing, while he regards Ralph's elder brother, Thomas, as the main figure in the development of POV shots and match on action.[119] Cecil B. DeMille develops the use of off-screen space. In The Cheat, action taking place off-screen is introduced by a shot of a

[114] Fairservice, p.60.
[115] Burch, Life to Those Shadows, p.212.
[116] Bordwell, On the History of Film Style, p.132. Also Fairservice, p. 127.
[117] Salt, Film Style and Technology, p.162.
[118] Fairservice, p.72.
[119] Ibid. p.119.

character whose glance is directed off-screen.[120] For Fairservice, though, the key figure is Barker. Barker's films were 'representative of a revolution in film structuring which took place between 1912 and 1915.'[121] This revolution was the blending of the former objectivity (frontality, long frames) with the subjectivity of the characters (POV, SRS). In other words, the CS.

In this blend of objectivity/subjectivity, frontality/three-dimensionality, the ES is the element which retains the objectivity and frontality. It is the bearer of the tradition conveying space (as a means of conveying narrative) to the spectator, found in Graeco-Roman theatre, Renaissance painting, and nineteenth century theatre. This tradition became within the CS the only valid aesthetical option for conveying film space to the spectator. Removing the ES would have meant a significant break with this tradition. It would create an entirely cinematographic space. Thus within the CS, experimentation with film space ceased.

[120] Ibid. p.127.
[121] Ibid.

PART II

THE CREATION AND PERCEPTION OF FILM SPACE. THE IRRELEVANCE OF THE ESTABLISHING SHOT FOR THE CREATION OF SPATIAL CONTINUITY.

SEMANTIC COMPLETION.

Attempts to analyse theoretically how film space is created by means of film editing and thereafter perceived by the spectator are first made in Central and Eastern Europe during the silent period. The Russians Lev Kuleshov, Vsevold Pudovkin, and Sergei Eisenstein; the Hungarian Béla Balázs; and the Czech Jan Mukařovský are those responsible for these attempts. All but one, Mukařovský, were active filmmakers. Their theories had two things in common: first, they are all montage based theories, that is, montage (film editing) is the main tool to convey the narrative and the space to the spectator; secondly, all agree in that the basis for the conveying of film space lies in the idea that the whole is created by the parts. In editing terms, their theories agree in that no ES is needed to convey film space. The conveying and perception of a whole filmic space is achieved by only showing parts of that whole space. Thus Kuleshov and Pudovkin argue that a synthesis of individual units (celluloid frames) creates a (whole) shot; a synthesis of shots creates a (whole) sequence; and so on. Likewise, Balázs argues that a synthesis of 'sectional pictures' (shots) creates in the consciousness of the spectator a total scene. Eisenstein argues that by the juxtaposition of attractions (shots) a new whole is created. Mukařovský argues that individual illusory spaces create a unified three dimensional space. Each with his own variation (I shall analyse each of the theorists individually later); all seem to have the same starting point. Jan Kučera, professor of film editing at FAMU, later synthesises the above theories into one, his own, and passes the ideas on to his students.

The reason why the above theorists have the idea, that the whole is created by the parts as the basis for their montage theories, is that since the end of the nineteenth century and culminating in the 1920s and 30s, this was one of the major ideas discussed amongst academics and other intellectuals in Central and Eastern Europe. It was the basis of holism in biology; of the Gestalt theories in psychology ; of Husserl's phenomenology; of Russian Formalism; and later of Czech Structuralism; one of the leading members of the Structuralist School, Mukařovský, found that the idea was particularly suited to cinema. Or rather he realised that cinema, and, in particular, film editing were particularly well suited for the theoretical application of the idea of 'semantic completion'. And consciously or unconsciously, Kuleshov, Pudovkin, Eisenstein, Balázs (and later) Kučera presumably thought much the same.

This concept, however, is already contained within the synecdoche, whereby a part is made to represent the whole or vice versa used directly by Eisenstein. The synecdoche does not create the whole itself, but the whole is already perceived in the part. A series of parts will create the perception of the whole.

Aristotle writes that the 'whole is prior to the parts' when discussing the relationship between the form and matter of things.[1] Cicero tells the story of Zeuxis of Heraclea, a painter who was commissioned by the people of the town of Croton to paint a picture of Helen for the temple of Juno. Zeuxis wished to paint Helen in such a way 'that the portrait, though silent and lifeless might embody the surpassing beauty of womanhood' (ut excellentem muliebris formae pulcritudinem muta in se imago contineret).[2] Knowing that perfection is not to be found in Nature, Zeuxis chose five naked maidens, the most beautiful he could find in Croton, and from each girl he chose her most beautiful part. He then combined these parts in the picture of Helen. Cicero uses this story to illustrate his justification for not choosing one single style of rhetoric for his text-book, but instead merging several different styles. The story is then repeated by Pliny the Elder in his Natural History[3], a version that was often quoted in the Italian Renaissance regarding ideal beauty. The interpretation of the story made in the Renaissance is much closer to the concept of the whole found in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[4] In the eighteenth century Lessing makes use of the concept to analyse the difference in perception of spatial and temporal arts and according to Ash it is Goethe who introduces the concept to the nineteenth century's 'formal thought'.[5] The concept is then present in Romanticism, for example in Theophile Gautier's Mademoiselle de Maupin. D'Albert, one of the epistolary narrators of the novel, is describing his search for the ideal woman, the ideal beauty, to a friend. He knows that the object of his search is hopelessly unattainable since it is a beauty in woman that is abstract and therefore does not exist in the real world. Nevertheless, he is in love with this idea of beauty. It exists in his mind. It has been formed through the perception and knowledge of the existence of works of art. The narrator has selected the most beautiful parts of each work, synthesising them into one

---

[1] Mitchell G. Ash, Gestalt Psychology in German Culture 1890 - 1967, Cambridge, 1995, p.85. (henceforth Ash)
[2] Cicero, De inventione, II, 1, 1-3, Cambridge, MA, London, 1949.
[3] Pliny, Natural History, XXXV, 64, Cambridge, MA, London, 1952.
[4] See James Hall, A History of Ideas and Images in Italian Art, New York, 1983, 259; Leon Battista Alberti, On Painting, London, 1991, paragraph 56; Rudolf Arnheim, Art and Visual Perception, 1967, p.155.
[5] Ash, p.85.

whole ideal beauty. To that he adds what the poets have written about mythological women, for example, the beautiful hands of Danae. He also adds the recollection of his own experience. He achieves this by means of synecdoche: 'You have guessed an arm from a hand, a knee from an ankle. What you saw was perfect; you imagined the rest accordingly and completed it with beautiful details from elsewhere.'[6] The perceiver has the capacity to complete, imagine, what he has not perceived.

In Pliny, Cicero, and in particular, in the Renaissance, the concept already has the notion that something more than a whole is created by synthesising different parts: Zeuxis not only creates a whole woman but portrays ideal beauty. This notion appears in holism (mainly in anti-mechanistic biology) during the last decade of the nineteenth century. The parts do not merely create the whole but also a quality which goes beyond the whole. This notion which is found in Smut's notion of the biological whole, and in the works of the Czech biologist, Jan Bělehradek, who states that 'a whole which is more than the sum of its parts has an inwardness of structure'.[7] The whole then becomes an organism, structured upon a hierarchy in which the different parts are affected by a series of 'interconnections'.[8] This view is echoed in psychology, for example in the writings of Wilhelm Wundt when he states that 'every perception is divisible into elementary sensations. But it is never the sum of these sensations, rather something new with specific qualities arising from their connection.'[9] In other words, importance is being given not only to the sum of the parts (the whole) but to the process, to the series of interconnections. Wilhem Dilthey, from the Leipzig School of holistic psychology states that the whole is not static but dynamic.[10] The importance given to the process will be adopted by Gestalt psychology, Husserlian phenomenology, Russian Formalism, and Czech Structuralism. In Gestalt psychology it will be found in the concept of psychological wholes, and in the Prague Linguistic Circle, in the concept of the structure (hence Czech 'Structuralism').[11]

This dynamic process by which the parts interact to create a whole is called form (Gestalt), hence Gestalt psychology. Christian von Ehrenfels, one of the founders of Gestalt psychology who taught at Prague University, stated in 1890, in relation to the perception of melodies, in one the founding documents of Gestalt theory, 'that

---

[6] Theophile Gautier, Mademoiselle de Maupin.
[7] Peter Steiner, 'The Conceptual Basis of Prague Structuralists', in Ladislav Matějka (ed.) Sound, Sign, and Meaning, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1978, p.35.
[8] Bohuslav Havránek, 'Czech Linguistics' in Matějka, pp.....
[9] Ash, p.61.
[10] Ibid. p.72.
[11] Steiner in Matejka, p.353.

forms must be something different from the sum of the elements'.[12] He applied this concept not only to melodies but also to sentences, that is, how the sense of the sentence is conveyed by means of the component words.[13] Ehrenfels was also the first to speak of the Gestaltqualität of the parts, whereby 'in perceiving a melody (...) one is aware of more than its individual components. A special quality enables us to perceive these parts, i.e., as belonging to a whole.'[14] The Gestaltqualität, then, behaves in a similar way to the synecdoche.

The premises and concept which are echoed in Husserl's phenomenology. In particular, in his 'Investigation III' of his Logical Investigations, which deals with non-independent wholes. Husserl calls this non-independent whole, 'contexture'.[15] Mukařovský will later use the same term to differentiate his two types of artistic wholes. For Mukařovský a contexture is a whole of 'relatively non-independent parts'. Contexture is the same concept of interaction among parts within an organised hierarchy to create a whole. But Husserl differs from the Gestalt School in that

> the intentionality of our consciousness is the most important factor in the perception of temporal objects. While Gestalt psychology attempted to expand the notion of the whole from the realm of mental processes to the realm of physical reality, Husserl's interpretation always insisted upon consciousness as the indispensable factor in creating unity. If we are 'set' to a particular unit for its own sake, we perceive it alone as 'now'. But if our intention is directed toward the whole, the whole is present through retention, as long as the last unit of the whole is perceived. And since every work of art is a temporal object, the inclusion of the perceiver in the study of the artistic structure seems to be inevitable.[16]

The key words here are perception and retention. The whole, then, is created by the perceiver, by his/her ability to retain the parts. Mukařovský will continue to study the perceiver. In cinema this line of investigation, particularly suited due to its temporality, due to the dynamic process which is editing, will also be developed by Balázs, Eisenstein and Kučera. The spectator creates the whole space, first by

[12] Ash, p.88.
[13] Ibid. p.172.
[14] Steiner in Matejka, p.353.
[15] Ibid. p.354.
[16] Ibid.

perceiving the shots, then by retaining them.

All this is also found in Russian Formalism, with one addition, that of Hegelian dialectics. For Yuri Tynyanov, 'the artistic work is a dialectical whole, the elements of which are charged with energy and therefore exist in a permanent state of struggle for domination.'[17] Regarding their investigations about cinema, Poetika kino (1928), the Russian Formalist were also influenced by Balázs's Der sichtbare Mensch (1925) (The Visible Man) as I shall analyse later.

The Prague Linguistic Circle absorbs all these teachings into Structuralism. Czech Structuralism has elements of Gestalt theory, Husserlian phenomenology and Russian Formalism (in particular the dialectical approach), and with these elements continues to develop the concept of the whole. Russian Formalism had a direct influence on the Prague Linguistic Circle since both 'schools' shared members: for example, Roman Jakobson, was a founding member of the Moscow Linguistic Circle (together with the OPOYAZ in Leningrad, it integrated what was known as Russian Formalism) and after he emigrated to Czechoslovakia in 1920, also a founding member of the Prague Linguistic Circle, established in 1926 at Prague University. The leading figure of the Prague Linguistic Circle was to become Jan Mukařovský.

The development introduced by Mukařovský to the concept of the whole is semiotic. It is by means of a structure that the perceiver perceives meaning. In Mukařovský the whole becomes semantic in nature: 'The work of art is a very complex sign: each of its components and each of its parts is a vehicle of partial meaning. These partial meanings comprise the total meaning of the work (...) but before the perceiver reaches the total meaning he must have experienced the process of the creation of the total meaning.'[18] Here the influence of Gestalt, Formalism, and Husserl can be seen in the notion that the whole is more than the sum of its parts, and in the importance given to the process and in the emphasis on the perceiver, respectively. Like the Formalists, Mukařovský is also interested in studying works of art from the point of view of the parts that make the whole. Mukařovský refers to wholes in art as útvar (configuration) and he differentiates between two types: composition, to refer to static or spatial configurations; and contexture to refer to dynamic or temporal configurations.[19] But later he comes to the conclusion that all arts

---

[17] Ibid. p.355.
[18] Jan Mukařovsky, 'On Structuralism', in Jan Mukařovsky, Structure, Sign, Function, New Haven, London, 1977, p.8.
[19] Steiner in Matejka, p.354.

are temporal, that is, they are processes taking place in time:

> Every work of art therefore appears to the perceiver as a semantic continuity, as a contexture. Every new sign which the perceiver apprehends during the process of perception (that is, every component and every part of a work when entering the meaning-creating process of contexture) not only attaches itself to those which have penetrated previously into the perceiver's consciousness but also to a greater or lesser extent the meaning of everything that has preceded.[20]

Here Husserl's notion of retention is implied. It is retention that enables the perceiver to apprehend the signs, and that causes the signs to interact in order to create the meaning. The total meaning, then, is not created until the last sign is perceived, since the addition of one more sign causes the whole to mutate. This is premise which also contains a dialectical quality since each element (sign) interacts with the others within the process. Mukařovský

> considers as a structure only such a set of elements, the internal equilibrium of which is constantly disturbed and restored anew and the unity of which thus appears to us as a set of dialectic contradiction. That which endures is only the identity of the structure in the course of time, whereas its natural composition - the correlation of its components - changes continuously.[21]

The concept of the whole is taken up again by the Constance School of Literary Studies in the 1970s. They refer to their method as Rezeptionästhetik (aesthetics of reception or 'reception theory') and they apply it to the analysis, broadly speaking, of the reader and his/her response to the literary text. They are influenced by all the former 'schools' and likewise by the film theorists who dealt with the concept of the whole, in particular by Béla Balázs. All the basic premises used by their predecessors are to be seen again in their analyses:

> Apperception can only take place in phases, each of which contains aspects of the object to be constituted, but none of which can claim to be representative

[20] Mukařovsky, 'On Structuralism', p.8.
[21] Ibid. p.3.

> of it. Thus the aesthetic object cannot be identified with any of its manifestations during the time flow of the reading. The incompleteness of each manifestation necessitates synthesis, which in turn brings about the transfer of the text to the reader's consciousness .[...] The sentences set in motion a process which will lead to the formation of the aesthetic object as a correlative in the mind of the reader.[22]

They also base their analysis of the sentence on concepts found in Husserl and Mukařovský. The former's concept of ideation (developed from that of retention) and the latter's premise that meaning is conveyed temporally, are used by reception aesthetics to reach similar conclusions about how the reader perceives the meaning of the sentence: the components (images) of a sentence interact in succession to create the meaning gradually in the mind of the reader, meaning which is not found in any one component alone. Each new component perceived in time modifies the previous component and is modified by the following.[23] This is very much in the way Balázs argues that a film sequence is perceived by the spectator:

> even the most meaningful take is not sufficient to give the meaning its total meaning. This is ultimately decided by the position of the picture between other pictures [...] In every case and unavoidably the picture takes on its meaning by way of its place in the series of associations [...] the pictures are, as it were, loaded with a tendency toward a meaning and this is fulfilled at the moment when it makes contact with the other pictures.[24]

What Balázs refers as 'loaded with a tendency towards a meaning', Husserl refers as 'protension', the reception theorists as 'expectation', that is, what is contained within a component and carries the perceiver to the next component in the temporal flow.[25] Reception theorists develop this premise into what they call 'hollow section' and a 'retrospective section'. Each component (correlate) of a sentence has both a hollow and retrospective section. The hollow 'looks forward to the next correlate', the retrospective to the previous one.[26] It is a premise which already appears in Kučera

---

[22] Wolfang Iser, The Act of Reading. A Theory of Aesthetic Response, Baltimore, London, 1980, p.109.
[23] Ibid. p.148.
[24] Béla Balázs, Der Geist der Films, Halle, 1930, p.46 quoted in Iser p.195.
[25] Iser p.110.
[26] Ibid. p.117.

when he states that each shot raises some questions which are answered in the next and answers the questions put forward by the preceding shot(s).

This premise is already present in the synecdoche, in what Gautier refers to as the capacity to complete by the perceiver. This is what in psychology is termed a 'faculty of projection', 'the projection of one's own ideas, imagination, onto the perceived image.'[27] And this is possible due to the experience of the perceiver, Gautier implies. The recognition of part of an object enables the perceiver to imagine the totality of that object precisely because the perceiver has seen that object before in its totality and therefore knows what it looks like. In the words of Philostratus's parable of Apollonius of Tyana, as cited by Gombrich: 'For this reason I should say that those who look at works of painting and drawing must have the imitative faculty and that no one could understand the painted horse or bull unless he knew what such creatures are like'.[28] Old-fashioned as the concept of mimesis might be, it is still valid, at least regarding film space. A spectator perceiving part of a room by means of a shot is capable of imagining the whole room because he/she knows what a room (any room) looks like (unless he/she has never been in a room in his/her life).

[27] Ernst Gombrich, Art and Illusion, 5th edn, London, 1977, p.172.
[28] Ibid. p.155.

FIRST ATTEMPTS AT THEORIZING SPATIAL CONTINUITY: KULESHOV AND PUDOVKIN.

It was the early Soviet directors who started to understand that film space was essentially different from that borrowed from other artistic traditions as applied in the American classical style. The Soviet directors were heavily influenced by 'Griffith and Co', but they took over the Americans' editing-based cinema and developed it, and in the process drew important conclusions about film space. They still used the ES, and based their editing techniques on continuity and on analytical editing, but at the same time they began to question in their experiments the necessity of the ES in both the creation of film space and the creation of a continuity for the narration. By studying American films Kuleshov, Pudovkin, Eisenstein, and other Soviet directors like Konzintsev and Trauberg began to realise 'that only what happens in frame is important, that the only film space, is screen space'.[29] As Bordwell states, the Soviet directors tended to 'minimize or omit the establishing shot'[30] and thus asked the spectator to contribute in the creation of film space. With their omission of the ES the Soviet directors reached the conclusion that the 'spectator will infer a unified space based on assumptions about real spaces and about the sort of space that films usually present'.[31]

The two main figures in the experimentation with film space are Kuleshov and Pudovkin. Their studies started as a reaction to the frontality found in the long tableau-like scenes of early pre-Soviet Russian films (which, as Bordwell argues, did not differ much from what was being done in the rest of Europe[32]), as a reaction to the theatrical space intrinsically found in these scenes/shots.[33] In other words, like other filmmakers, Pudovkin and Kuleshov were searching for three dimensionality.[34] They found their way away from the monotony of Russian films, as Kuleshov has put it,[35] and towards three-dimensionality, by studying the dynamically edited films coming from America. These 'monotonous' Russian films, though, were searching for three-

[29] Noel Burch, Theory of Praxis, London, 1973, p.10.
[30] Bordwell, Narration in the Fiction Film, London, 1985, p.243.
[31] Ibid.
[32] Bordwell, On the History of Film Style, p. 135; see also Pudovkin, V I, Film Technique, London, 1933, p.81.
[33] Kuleshov, L, 'The Art of Cinema', 1929, in Kuleshov On Film, Berkeley, 1974, p.46.
[34] Bordwell, On the History of Film Style, p.183.
[35] See n. 60.

dimensionality by other means, mainly through staging in depth. This is the case of Evgenii Bauer. His films are staged in depth and make use of an original style of panning and tracking to achieve three-dimensionality. Occasionally, Bauer also uses analytical montage to convey narrative space to the spectator. And on one occasion he does not use the ES. The ES is absent in a scene from The Dying Swan (1916). The scene takes place in a theatre where the main character, a painter obsessed with death, attends a performance of the ballet 'The Dying Swan', to seek inspiration for his portrayal of death in a painting he is currently painting. The scene runs as follows:

1.LS of theatre boxes. The painter and a friend enter one of them (from the right of the screen). They look obliquely leftwards (of the screen), perhaps in to the stalls.
2.LS of the stalls. The backs of the audience are seen. The stage can barely be seen at the background of the shot (top right hand corner of the frame) behind some heads of members of the audience.
3.LS. Frontal shot of the stage. The dancer dances the last bars of the dying swan.
4.MS of the painter and his friend sitting in the box, facing the camera, looking left of the screen (slightly to the centre of the frame, almost into the camera).
5.MS of the dancer (the swan is dying). The shot's axis and frontality is the same as in shot 3. The swan dies.
6.MS of the painter and friend in the box clapping. The camera position and angle has changed from shot 4. Now it more to their right. Both are now looking to the right of the frame.
7.LS of the audience in the stalls (now taken from their front). They are giving a standing ovation. They look to the right of the screen. The camera angle is slightly high, that is, the shot is 'taken' from the stage. Probably it intends to be a POV shot of the dancer.
8.Cont. of 6.

In eight shots Bauer achieves the unity of the space (that is, the painter is sitting in the theatre where the dancer is on the stage) with no ES. Indeed, in shot 2 part of the empty stage can be seen, but this is a minimal part of the stage, and secondly, it can barely be seen over the heads of the audience. I myself had to watch the scene several times and make use of the 'pause' offered by technology in order to notice the stage. Kuleshov had been set designer for Bauer's film, King of Paris, and later acted in and

actually finished Bauer's last film After Happiness (Za schast'n) (1917) when the latter died during the filming. Kuleshov though, never refers to Bauer and claims that the only model for the Soviet directors, particularly for himself and for the members of his workshop, was American montage-based cinema. Because of this style they reached the conclusion that 'the foundation of art is editing',[36] or in Kuleshov's words: 'montage is the foundation of cinematography'[37]; he argues that 'editing is a method that renounces theatrical method'.[38] Every art has a raw material. The raw material of cinema is celulloid, or more precisely, the 'separate strips of celluloid'.[39] Even more precisely, cinema's raw material is that which is framed within each strip of celluloid. 'Montage [editing] is the organisation of [this] cinematic material'.[40] The importance of these conclusions lies in the fact that they are referring to the film shot, as a synthesis of individual unity, the celluloid frames, and thus the shot itself becomes an individual unity, which when put together through montage with other shot-unities it becomes a 'synthesis of different separate visual images'.[41] These separate shots refer back (if the American continuity style is taken as an example) to a whole, or can create a whole but without the whole itself existing whether in reality or shown in one single shot. In other words, the whole is created by the parts.[42]

This can be applied to film narrative and time, but specially to film space. Pudovkin without referring to the ES is already arguing that within the 'set of norms' which constitute the CS the ES is not prescriptive: 'The spectator is shown an incident, even sometimes an actor not as a whole, but consecutively by aiming the camera at various parts of the scene or human body. This kind of construction of a picture, the resolving of the material into its elements and subsequent building from them a filmic whole is called '"constructive editing"'.[43] Indeed one of the experiments carried out by Kuleshov was precisely the creation of a whole woman from details of different women: close-ups of the hands, feet, head and so on of different women shown in succession created the impression of one single 'moving body'.[44] This, one of the four 'Kuleshov effects', seems to be Kuleshov's cinematographic answer to

[36] Pudovkin, Film Technique, p. xiii.
[37] Kuleshov, On Film, p.42.
[38] Pudovkin, Film Technique, p.xvii.
[39] Ibid. p.xiv.
[40] Kuleshov, On Film, p. 48.
[41] Pudovkin, Film Technique, p. xv.
[42] Kuleshov, Pudovkin, and Eisenstein would later influence the ideas on film of the Russian Formalists. See Poetika Kino, Russian Poetics in Translation, 9, 1982.
[43] Pudovkin, Film Technique, p. 3.
[44] Ibid. p. 117.

Zeuxis search for the ideal beauty of Helen. Although Kuleshov was not indeed searching for beauty but rather for the nature of film space.[45]

The material found in the celluloid has created a filmic whole which is different from that found in reality. In the words of Pudovkin, 'the material of the film director consists not of real processes happening in real space and in real time, but these pieces of celluloid on which these processes have been recorded'.[46] Early Soviet directors opposed film time to real time; they opposed film space to real space. This is something which the traditionalists have failed to understand. Perhaps due to the interference of traditions alien to film, they do not seem to differentiate between film space and real space. For them an ES is an attempt at faithfully representing real space in film. By real space they mean the space of a theatre stage.

Pudovkin argued his ideas within a system of narrative continuity in which the director has to select the shots which will convey the narration. In other words, analytical editing. His model was the American films, but he is already questioning them. In particular, the technique of inserting close-ups within the ES. He writes that this technique 'has nothing to do with constructive editing'.[47] He argues that 'the details organically belonging to scenes [...] must not be interpolated into the scene, but the latter must be built out of them'.[48] Although this statement does not eliminate the ES, it already hints at the possibility that it is not needed for narrative purposes. Like his American counterparts he also puts the emphasis of narrative development in directing the attention of the spectator to the important details of the scene with the help of editing and continuity:

> The basic significance of the constructive editing of scenes [is that] it builds the scenes from separate pieces of which each concentrates the attention of the spectator only on that element important to the action. [...] In this sequence must be expressed a special logic that will be apparent only if each shot contains an impulse towards transferring attention to the next.[49]

---

[45] For an analysis of the 'Kuleshov Effect' see Ronald Levaco, 'Kuleshov', Sight and Sound, 40, 1971, 2, pp. 86-91, 109; Vance Kepley jr., 'The Kuleshov Workshop', Iris, 14, 1, 1986; Yuri Tsivian (ed.), Ekaterina Khokhlova, Kristin Thompson (intro.), 'The rediscovery of a Kuleshov Experiment', Film History, 8, 1996, pp. 357-364.
[46] Ibid. p.56.
[47] Ibid. p.23.
[48] Ibid.
[49] Ibid. p. 42.

Here there is a probable influence of Husserl's notion of protension, and perhaps Balázs's notion that a shot has a tendency forwards, and later it looks forward to Kučera's principle of question and answer within a shot. Here, then, the ES is neither encouraged, nor discouraged. The emphasis for the transference of attention (and to narration) is put on the shot itself without referring back to the ES. In other words, there is no match-on-action, no 180 rule, no direction match. Pudovkin does not mention it but it is a potential consequence.

The example he gives, though, has no ES: '(1) A man turns his head and looks. (2) What he looks at is shown'.[50] Pudovkin is arguing that the film director can influence the logic behind the images by selecting only what is important for the development of the narration. Pudovkin's example therefore, without the ES, is an example of an extreme concentration of time and space which eliminates whatever is unnecessary for the understanding of the narration by the spectator.[51] It eliminates unnecessary space. It is unnecessary, since the spectator understands, or rather, perceives the logic synthesising both shots. Further experiments carried out by Kuleshov and Pudovkin showed that this logic varied depending on what was shown in what order. In one experiment they had three shots: shot A was the face of an actor smiling; shot B showed the same face frightened; shot C showed a revolver being pointed at somebody. Depending on the order these shots were shown, it would convey one or another meaning to the spectator. If shown in the following order, A C B, the spectator gets the impression that the person has been frightened after seeing the revolver being pointed at him. If, on the other hand, they are shown following the order B C A, Pudovkin argues that the person is not afraid of the revolver.[52] Similarly in another of the 'Kuleshov effects', the logic of the scene varied depending on what was shown after the close-up of Mozzhukhin's face. In each case the close-up was exactly the same but in one sequence it was followed by a shot of a plate of soup; in another by a shot of a dead woman in a coffin; in a third by a shot of a little girl. According to Pudovkin these sequences conveyed 'pensiveness, deep sorrow and happiness' respectively, as in each case the spectator perceived each pair of shots as sharing the same space: 'it was obvious and certain that Mozzhukhin was looking at his soup'.[53] Notably these were experiments isolated from proper narrative but they do

---

[50] Ibid.
[51] Pudovkin, Film Technique, p.64.
[52] Ibid. p. 139.
[53] Ibid. p. 140. see Kuleshov, p. 54. For the various versions of the experiment see n.46.

show their awareness that somehow film space is perceived and understood differently by the spectator; that the narrative is transmitted more through the logic of the images themselves than by showing the whole real space where the narrative takes place, since the topographical references of a scene can be achieved through the logic of the images. Indeed, Kuleshov did apply these 'creative geography' techniques to more narrative experiments. For example, in the famous 'White House' experiment, where two characters meet in front of the White House.[54] There was another yet more dramatic experiment involving a jealousy scene taking place in a balcony where a man is threatening a woman, possibly his wife, with a pistol. The jealousy scene is observed by a man from below in the street. No ES is shown during the scene establishing the street and the balcony.[55] Salt argues that the 'Kuleshov effect' was 'common practice since the beginning of the century in Europe'.[56] Bauer should clearly be included among those who carried out 'Kuleshov effects' before Kuleshov.

Pudovkin and Kuleshov, by isolating and defining what is cinematographic material, made an important distinction between real space and film space. It is through this distinction that they develop their technique of 'constructive editing'. And as theorists they already attempt to understand and explore how this technique works. They conclude that this technique constructs space due to the logic contained within the images and which the director manipulates in order to create a continuity in the attention of the spectator.

Paradoxically, Kuleshov hardly, if at all, made use of this technique in his films. On the other hand, Pudovkin made extensive use of it in his silent films. The only example of constructive editing used by Kuleshov is found in The Extraordinary Adventures of Mr West in the Land of the Bolsheviks, (1924),[57] when Jeddie, Mr West's faithful 'bodyguard' is introduced to the spectators:

1.Jeddie is seen in a long shot taking aim with his gun and shooting.

2.Reverse, POV shot of empty bottles being hit by gun shots.

---

[54] For an experiment with the same principle of 'reflexive off-screen space' more imbedded in narrative, see the experiment with the 'White House', in Pudovkin p.60, in Kuleshov p.52.

[55] Yuri Tsivian 'The Rediscovery of a Kuleshov Experiment', Film History p.359.

[56] Barry Salt, Film Style and Technology, p. 240.

[57] I have used the following versions of the film analysed: Kuleshov: Neobychainye priklyucheniya Mistera Westa v strane bol'shevikov, 1924, USSR. DVD version; Pudovkin: Mat', 1926, USSR.DVD version; Konets Sankt-Peterburga, 1927, USSR. DVD; Potomok Changis-Khana, 1928, USSR. DVD; Romm, Pyshka, 1934, USSR. VHS.

3.Cut back to shot number 1.

4.Again shot 2. All the bottles are hit.

5.Finally a close-up of Jeddie's face smiling, proud that he is such an excellent shot.

It is a reflexive use of off-screen space. The shots of the bottles are 'in theory' from Jeddie's point of view: the spectator sees the same as Jeddie is seeing. This use of reflexive shots is, again, one of the simplest instances, where no ES is needed. These reflexive shots are also used by Pudovkin. For example, at the beginning of Mother (1926). The film opens with

1.Long shot of a policeman looking towards the left of the screen.

2.Long shot of a house (bar).

3.Long medium shot of the house. The door is now shown more clearly. It suddenly opens and a drunkard is thrown out with some violence.

4.Middle shot of the drunkard reclining by one of the posts supporting the roof of the house.

5.Close-up of his face .

6.Long shot of the drunkard from a different angle. He looks down at another drunkard who is lying on the muddy street.

Shot 2 is an ES of the scene as seen by the policeman, who is never shown in any of the shots after shot 1. Shots 2 to 6 are reflexive in relation to the policeman. The spectator does not need an ES to understand that the policeman is watching the scene.

Constructive editing is also used in what could be termed 'mutually reflexive shots'. Again in Mother, Pudovkin uses this technique when the son has to hide the guns he has been given by the Party. The scene starts with a

1.Long shot of the son walking towards the middle of the room. He stops and looks towards the left of the screen.

2.Middle shot of the mother sleeping (that is, shot 2 shows what the son is watching)

3. Continuation of shot 1. The son walks to a spot in the room, stoops and hides

the guns . He looks left.

4.Close-up of the mother opening her eyes. She is looking towards the right of the screen.

5.Long shot of the son seen from a different angle from that shown in shot 1 (This is the mother's reflexive shot. This effect is further emphasised by showing the beginning of the shot out of focus and gradually focusing, imitating thus the opening of her eyes after she has been woken up).

6.Close up of the mother shutting her eyes.

At no point in the scene are the mother and son shown together in the same shot: the shots of the mother are the reflexive off-screen space of the son and vice versa (but only retroactively, once the mother opens her eyes). This reflexive shot technique is again used at the last scene (almost the last two shots) of The End of St Petersburg, (1927) when the mother enters the palace, bringing food, and is confronted by a soldier at the stairs. This confrontation (and the final smiles of both characters) is shown through 'mutually' reflexive shots, with no ES. In other words, the shot-reverse-shot technique does not need the ES.

Pudovkin makes use of more complex 'constructive editing' where the reflexive use of off-screen is not divided into one or two opposing characters' points of view, but where a whole locale is divided into three or four parts. The technique has already developed from one reflexive point of view (as seen in the example of the policeman) to three reflexive views. This technique is now able to convey long complex narrative scenes without the use of the ES to establish the topography of the locale. It ceases to be a merely reflexive use of off-screen space and starts to create film space.

This can be seen when the British delegation meets the Dalai Lama in Storm Over Asia, (1928). The scene starts as follows

1.Close-up of incense burning

2.Medium shot of a Buddha's head

3.Medium shot of the British general and his wife. Their gaze is directed towards the left of the screen.

4.Medium long shot of the Buddha which dissolves into a

5.Long shot of the Buddha which dissolves into a

6.Medium shot of the general and his wife. (This shot is almost frontal.) They still

look towards the left.

7.Long shot of the general, his wife and the members of the general's staff. All looking towards the left of the screen.

8.Continuation of 5. fades out.

9.Fade-in into a long shot of the five-year-old Lama.

10.Medium shot of the Lama (almost frontal).

11.Medium close up of the general. Frontal shot.

12.Medium close-up of one of the British officers, looking left (of the screen) .

13.Medium close-up of another officer.

14.Medium shot of Lama (followed by inter title).

15.Cont. of 11.

16.Plan-américain of Lama's aide.

17.Cont. of 14.

18.Almost like 11.

19.Like 14, but closer frame.

20.Medium close-up of a monk's hand holding a string of beads.

21.Close-up of the Lama's feet.

22.Medium close-up of his hands.

23.Cont. of 11. The general bows.

24.Plan-americain of several monks. They look towards the right of the screen.

25.Cont. of 23. End of the bow (+ inter title). He is looking left of the screen.

26.Similar shot to the previous.

27.Medium shot of monks looking left (that is, they are not looking at the Lama but at the British delegation).

28.Medium shot of a senior monk looking right of the screen.

29.Cont. of 27.

30.Medium shot of one of the monks seen in shot 27. Looking left.

31.Same shot of another monk.

32.Cont. of 26. (inter title) The general starts speaking.

33.Close-up of the Lama.

34.Like 32, but with the angle slightly changed.

35.Close-up of the general's hand together with the medals on his chest. He starts to bow again.

36.Close-up of the general's head. Continuation of the bow. His gaze is directed

towards the left of the screen.

37.Medium close-up of his wife. She bows. Looks left (of the screen).

38.Close-up of the Lama. He smiles.

39.Medium close-up of an officer. He smiles back, looking to the left of the screen.

40.Medium close-up of another officer. He also smiles. His gaze leftwards.

41.Cont. of 27

(At this point there is a parallel sequence of shots showing a horseman galloping towards the palace where the reception is taking place.)

42.Long shot of a room showing an empty wall. The soldier previously seen on the horse enters the frame and looks towards the left of the screen.

43.Medium shot of the general and an officer. The latter looks to the right of the screen.

44.Medium shot of the soldier asking the officer to come closer.

45.Cont. of 43. The officer exits the frame to the right.

46.Plan-americain. The officer enters from the left. On the right side of the frame the soldier is waiting.

47.Medium shot of monks seen from behind. One of them turns round and looks to the right of the screen.

48.Similar to 46 but with a more frontal angle (this is a reflexive shot from the point of view of the monk seen in the previous shot.) At the end of the shot the officer looks to the left of the screen.

49.Similar to 47. A second monk looks back. He first timidly looks to the left of the screen but then to the right. (This shot has now become retroactively a reflexive shot from the officer's point of view)

50.Cont. of 48.

51.Cont. of 43. The officer enters from right of the screen and speaks to the general.

52.Medium shot of the wife - she looks right of the screen (that is, she is now more interested n what the officer is telling the general than in the Lama).

53.Cont. of 43.

54.Frontal medium close-up of the general. (At this point a sequence of shots

shows a battle - the information the soldier had brought).

55.Cont. of 54.

56.Close-up of the general's hand and medals.

57.Similar to 33.

58.Medium shot of monks listening and looking left of the screen.

59.Long shot of monks listening and looking left of the screen.

60.Medium shot of the Buddha.

61.Long shot of the Buddha.

This sequence has no ES. Nevertheless, the spectator perceives the locale as a whole. In this case the 'whole' has been divided into (mainly) three parts: the Lama; the British delegation; the monks (The Buddha seen at the beginning and end of the scene can be partially seen behind the Lama.) Each segment has a partial ES: the British general and his staff are shown together; most of the monks are shown together at some point. But none of the members of each side is related to the other side by means of one single shot. It is clear from the shots that the means by which each side is 'established' to the rest is the direction of the characters' gazes: the British delegation is always seen looking to the left of the screen (and normally slightly looking downwards). The spectator perceives that the Lama is to the right of the delegation. On the other side the monks are seen looking to the right of the screen (slightly downwards) and occasionally to the left. The spectator perceives that the monks are to the right of the Lama and in front of the British delegation. At one point one of the officers walks towards the soldier who has just arrived. By showing the monks from behind, turning back and looking to the left of the screen, Pudovkin reveals to the spectator the fourth side of the locale. The spectator perceives that the officer, together with the soldier, is behind the monks and thereby behind all the other sides. The spectator perceives the topography of the room approximately in this way:

BUDDHA

LAMA

M
O
N
K
S

B
R
I
T
I
S
H

MONKS

OFFICER + SOLDIER

Using multiple reflexive points of view and no ES Pudovkin has created a filmic whole of the room where the spectator is able to orientate himself perfectly.

These examples show that the technique of constructive editing is based on reflexive shots. The simplest example uses one reflexive shot whereby a shot showing a man turning his head is followed by a shot of what he is seeing.[58] If what he sees is yet another man looking back at him the technique then develops into a shot-reverse-shot of off-screen spaces whereby each subsequent shot becomes retroactively the off-screen space of the preceding shot and vice versa. In the sequence A B A2 B2 A3 B3, shot B is the reflexive off-screen space of shot A, but subsequently shot A2 is the reflexive off-screen of shot B and so on. This technique is not restricted to only two off-screen spaces, several can be used , as seen in the above example from Storm Over Asia. From the inclusion in a

[58] See note 76.

sequence of shots of one isolated off-screen space we reach the stage where a series of off-screen spaces are integrated into each other to form a whole filmic space - or rather the illusion of it.

Furthermore a reflexive off-screen space can cease to be reflexive and become, so to speak, independent, and can even share the same reflexive off-screen space with the shot which has previously governed its reflexivity , or create a reflexive off-screen space of its own. For example, in Mother when they bring the corpse of the father into the house. The scene starts as follows:

1.Long shot of the mother with the guns her son had hidden away.
2.Long shot of the door and some steps - boots are seen crossing the screen.
3.Long shot of the mother quickly hiding the guns. She looks left of the screen.
4.Long shot of the door - they are carrying the father's corpse in, first through the front doors of the house.
5.Medium close-up of the mother. She is, almost frontally, looking into the camera but slightly to the left of the screen.
6.Close-up of the father's boots (the soles are seen) - they move towards the camera (that is, towards the mother).
7.Long shot of the mother. She is on her knees and then stands up.
8.Medium shot of the boots and the legs of the father while he is being placed on the table. The movement seen of the legs is from left to right of the screen (again towards the mother).
9.Close-up of the father's face.
10.Long shot of the neighbours gathering at the door of the room.
11.Close-up of one of the neighbours, a man. He looks towards the right of the frame.
12.Plan-americain of the mother looking towards the left.
13.Close-up of the father's face.
14.Cont. of 12.
15.Close-up of a woman looking to the right.

Except for shots 10, 11, and 15, this scene has been shot entirely from the mother's point of view. In other words, all shots except those mentioned above are the reflexive off-screen space of the shots showing the mother. Nevertheless, the space

shown in shots 10, 11, and 15 (that is, the shots showing the door of the room) was reflexively established in shot 6 when the father was carried in - even though it is a close-up detail of the door frame. But this space ceases to be reflexive in shots 10, 11, and 15 as the mother, after the father has been carried inside, is logically looking at her husband's dead body (and not at the door). Although the direction of the mother's and neighbours' gazes could indeed be looking at each other, the logic of the images, of the narrative, prevents the spectator from thinking this. Shots 10, 11, and 15 share the same off-screen space (that is, shots 9 and 13) as those shots showing the mother.

As used by Pudovkin constructive editing relies heavily on the eye-line match whenever there are two or more characters (that is, character A looks left of the screen and in the shot A's gaze meets B's who is approximately looking right of the screen, and so on) but it is not always necessary. For example, Dovzhenko, in one of the opening scenes of Earth (1930) shoots a scene, without an ES, where all the characters are shot individually and in very close frames (medium shots and medium close-ups) and where there are few eye-line matches. It is the scene where the old man is dying. It is preceded by a sequence of shots of a young woman, sunflower fields and close-ups of sunflowers. The scene proper starts with a

1.Medium shot of branches full of apples
2.Fade into a medium close-up of apples and branches
3.Close-up of apples
4.Close-up (frame closer) of apples
5.Close-up of one apple (so far the sequence follows the ES + details norm)
6.Fade into medium close-up of a heap of apples
7.Medium close-up of old man lying down (high angle camera) on a blanket. At the top left hand corner of the frame apples can be seen lying around. The old man is looking at them. He then looks slightly away from the apples to the left of the screen.
8.Medium shot of another old man looking down to the right of the camera (inter titles: 'Think you're dying')
9.Cont. of shot 7. (inter-title: 'I guess I am')
10.Medium close-up of a younger man (in his forties). He looks straight at the camera
11.Medium close-up of a middle-aged woman. She looks left of the screen

12.Medium shot of children playing surrounded by and playing with apples

13.Same shot as 8. The old man looking right, he then looks up (inter-title: 'Well, die if you must')

14.Long shot of fields

15.Medium shot of the man in shot 10

16.Medium close-up of young man looking down and left of the screen

17.Close-up of the profile of the man in shot 10. He is looking to the right of the screen

18.Same shot as 16 but now the young man is looking towards the left of the screen

19.Cont. of shot 8 (inter-title: 'But let me know whether you end up in Heaven or Hell')

20.Like 8 but frame slightly changed (inter title: 'And what it is like there')

21.Close-up of the dying man. First looking up to the top left of the screen and then slightly down to the left of the screen

22.Medium shot of the dying man. Now the camera takes him from the opposite angle. In the background apples can be seen. He still looks to the left of the screen.

23.Long shot of the wheat fields.

24.Medium close-up of the man in shot 10; he turns his head and looks towards the left of the screen (inter title: Seventy five years behind the plough.) Now a conversation ensues in shots 25-30

25.Close-up of a middle-aged man

26.Cont. of 18

27.Close-up of the old man in shot 8

28.Cont. of 26

29.Cont. of shot 8

30.Cont. of 28

31.Medium shot of dying man tries to sit up. High angle camera. Low camera. He looks up to the right of the screen.

32.Cont. of 30

33.Cont. of 31

34.Cont. of 32

35.Cont of 8

36.Cont. 31 (inter title: 'I'd like a bite to eat') He is offered an apple from the right of the screen

37.Cont. of 12

38.Similar to 31 but a medium close-up

39.Similar to 12 but medium close-up

40.Close-up of another child biting an apple

41.Cont. of 38

42.Cont. of 39

43.Cont. of 38

44.Medium shot of a woman holding a basket full of apples

45.Similar to shot 38 of dying man. The camera angle has slightly changed. (inter-title:' Good-bye') He lies down

46.Close-up of sunflower

47.Cont. of shot 7 of the dying man

48.Cont. of shot 15

49.Cont. of shot 34

50.Close-up of middle-aged man

51.Cont. of shot 11 she looks up to heaven

52.Cont. of 16 medium close-up

53.Similar to shot 7 but medium shot. The old man is dead. Fade out in black.

First, no ES has been used. Secondly, there are only strict eye-line matches between the two old men (shots 7,8,9,13,19,20,21) and between the old man and the young man (26,27,28,29,30). Shot 16, showing the young man looking down gives the impression that he is looking at the dying old man. The dying old man looks upwards at him in shots 31 and 33 but in the 'reverse' shots 32 and 34 the young man is not looking down but straight to the left of the screen. The dying old man then, has the old man to his right (left of the screen) and the young man to his left (right of the screen). These two face each other. The rest of the characters have no precise position in the probable topography of the scene and yet the illusion of one single whole space is created. Everybody is present at the death of this old man - even the children whose integration into the whole space is more by association (the apples). The apples also act as a lyrical contrast to the death of the old man. Equally the shots of the fields and the sunflowers might be the reflexive off-screen space of any of the characters or lyrical association. Even a non-causal logic in the sequence of shots creates an illusion of space.

Boule de Suif(1934), one of the last Soviet silent films, directed by Mikhail Romm, has a similar style to that of La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc. It is shot mainly in close-ups and medium close-ups but, it differs from Dreyer's film in that Romm only occasionally omits the establishing shot. For example, when Boule finally gives in and consents to have sexual intercourse with the Prussian officer. This short scene consists of only three shots:

1.Medium shot of the officer. He has his back towards the camera. He turns and looks slightly to the left of the camera. He starts buttoning up his jacket.
2.Middle close-up of Boule who starts on the contrary to undo her blouse. She looks right of the screen
3.Back to shot 1. Seeing this, the officer decides to leave his jacket open. He timidly smiles.

In another example a whole scene is shot without an establishing shot (when Boule refuses to give in to the demands of her fellow travellers, and these lose their patience). But the scene takes place in the locale where most of the film is set. In other words, the spectator has already seen the whole of the locale in several establishing shots and is therefore quite familiar with its topography. Furthermore, when all the participants of the scene leave the hall, an establishing shot of it is shown, empty. On the other hand, the spectator in this scene, although he is familiar with the locale, nevertheless is not shown the exact positions of each of the characters. This is done mainly through eye line matches.

Perhaps the most interesting example in which the establishing shot is absent in this film is the opening scene, as here there are no eye line matches. The space here is created by association and through the internal movement of frames. The scene starts as follows:

1.Medium close-up of a soldier's face. He is dead. In the background out of focus a soldier is seen standing by the corpse.
2.Medium close-up of a second dead soldier. He is lying on his back. Again the background shows out of focus two standing soldiers.
3.Medium close-up of a soldier' s corpse. The attention is drawn to the soldier's

fist in the middle of the composition. Out of focus background shows soldier standing

4.Medium close-up of dead soldier. In the background out of focus boots.

5.Medium close-up of dead soldier. In the background out of focus soldiers are seen marching. The movement of these soldiers is from right to left of the screen

6.Medium long shot (at some point it becomes a plan-americain) of soldiers marching (no dead bodies are seen). The movement is from right to left of the screen

7.Medium close-up of boots marching through the mud. The movement is from the lower right-hand corner of the frame to the top left-hand corner

8.Close-up of a soldier's face, marching. The face shows determination and fear at the same time. In the background another face is seen, out of focus.

9.Medium close-up of dead soldier. In the background, out of focus, boots march from right to left of the screen

10.Medium shot of soldiers marching away from the camera.

11.Cont. of shot 5.

Here the first four shots are perceived through the association of a) the theme of the shots, that is, the dead soldiers and b) of the elements surrounding the dead soldiers: the mud, the same sky (and lighting), the soldiers in the background. Then from shots 5 to 11, movement (or what in classic Hollywood norms is called direction match) unifies the space. The movement in these shots is always (with the exception of shots 8 and 10) from right to left of the camera. The movement has also a continuous narrative element: the boots, the soldiers marching to or from battle. The close-up of the soldier marching shows the face of one these anonymous 'boots'. Shot 10 showing the soldiers marching away from the camera gives the impression that the soldiers are leaving behind this field of corpses.

BÉLA BALÁZS AND THE TEMPORAL NATURE OF FILM SPACE

Béla Balázs's analysis of film space is concise, but thorough. He is particularly interested in how film space is perceived and in how spatial continuity is created. He developed these interests during the silent period in Der sichtbare Mensch, (Vienna, 1924) and Der Geist des Films (Berlin, 1930). In them he discussed how the spatial and temporal linking of the shots, what he termed as 'visuelle Kontinuität' (visual continuity), created the illusion of continuity in the spectator.[59] He is also interested in the physiognomy revealed by the CU and in how this physiognomy supports the perception of film space by the spectator. Balázs's film theory is based on montage. Like most of the theorists who developed their ideas during the silent period Balázs believes that it is through montage that cinema acquires the status of art, of an independent art form.

His ideas on montage are not only important in themselves, that is, for a proper understanding of a montage based spatial continuity, but also important for the central subject of this thesis in that Balázs taught at FAMU. His students consisted of the generation immediately before that of the Czechoslovak New Wave.[60] Furthermore, his ideas influenced those of Jan Kučera and through Kučera the editing techniques employed by the members of the New Wave.

In his Theory of Film, Character and Growth of a New Art, (London, 1952),[61] Balázs starts by differentiating film from other arts, in particular from theatre. Film differs from theatre, he maintains, in that the spectator perceives space differently. 'The basic formal principle of the theatre', writes Balázs, 'is that the spectator sees the enacted scene as a whole in space.'[62] Furthermore, each spectator 'sees the stage from a fixed unchanging distance', and with a fixed angle of vision.[63] Basing his ideas on montage, Balázs, states that in cinema the distance between the spectator and the scene varies within the scene itself, as well as in the angle of vision (the

[59] Balázs already developed these ideas during the silent period in Der sichtbare Mensch , Vienna, 1924, and Der Geist des Films , Berlin, 1930. See also Boris Eikhenbaum, 'Problems of Cine-Stylistics', Poetika Kino, Russian Poetics in Translation, 9, 1982, p. 19.
[60] See Vojtěch Jasný, Život a film, Prague, 1999, p.112.
[61] Béla Balázs, Film - Werden und Wesen einer neuen Kunst, Vienna, 1949. First published in Russian in 1945. It was translated into Slovak in 1958. I am using the re-edition of the 1952 London edition published in New York, 1970.
[62] Béla Balázs, Theory of Film, New York, 1970, p.30.
[63] Ibid.

perspective).[64] This is made possible through the 'division of the integral picture into sections or "shots".'[65] This division is what makes cinema art. The importance of Balázs's contrasting of theatre and cinema is twofold: he places the emphasis on the spectator's perception of space thereby giving the spectator an active role in the creation of spatial continuity, unlike the 'traditionalists', who assign the spectator only a passive role. Secondly, Balázs, like Kuleshov and Pudovkin and unlike the 'traditionalists', makes a distinction (although this distinction is still at an embryonic stage) between real space and filmed space, that is, the 'integral picture' as opposed to the sequential space of filmed sections. Balázs is identifying, in a similar way to Kuleshov and Pudovkin, the 'material' of montage: the 'material' is what is found within the filmed sections or shots (in the same way as words are the material of literature, so individual shots are the material of film. This identification is also fundamental to the thinking of the Russian Formalists and the Czech Structuralists). Although he shares these notions with Kuleshov and Pudovkin, he develops them further. His differentiation between real space and filmed space lies in his assigning an active role to the spectator. It is through the combination of these two ideas (active role of spectator and the identification of the nature of film material) that Balázs arrives at the temporal nature of film space and thus at the conclusion that no ES is needed either for the spatial orientation of the spectator.

Balázs argues that the spectator has an active role since the he/she has developed the ability to understand film techniques more or less at the same rate as cinema was developing them: 'The birth of film art led not only to the creation of new works of art but to the emergence of new human faculties with which to perceive and understand this new art'.[66] According to Balázs, the spectator 'learnt to integrate single disjointed pictures into coherent scene, without even becoming conscious of the complicated process involved'.[67] Soon after editing techniques were introduced the spectator understood them throughout the silent period; the spectator started to perceive them automatically, unconsciously and nevertheless actively, because not only does the spectator understand what is being shown to him/her, but also what is not shown to him stimulates his/her imagination.[68] This active role is important because, Balázs argues, it is this that unifies a sequence of shots, a scene. The unity

[64] Ibid.
[65] Ibid.
[66] Ibid. p.33.
[67] Ibid. p.35.
[68] Ibid. p.36.

comes into being only when the spectator contributes an association of ideas.[69]

Thus Balázs establishes the active role of the spectator during the process of montage through his/her perception. This active perception is 'dynamic'. It is the perception of a process that occurs in time. This notion recalls those of the Gestalt theorists and Husserlian phenomenology. The process here is montage. With this I do not mean the perception of the movement within the shots. Balázs was more interested in the perception of the movement from one shot to the other, that is, in the perception of the sequence of shots, which have been previously filmed separately ; 'the movement (of the camera's constantly changing view point) breaks up the object before the camera into sectional pictures or "shots" irrespective of whether the object is moving or motionless'.[70] The movement, then, exists in the succession of shots. It is (to use a simile that Balázs uses in another context,[71] like a musical melody (a simile which recalls Ehrenfels's ideas on how a melody is perceived). The movement exists in the succession of notes which create the melody. The melody is created once all the notes have been heard by the listener. According to Balázs, something similar occurs with the 'total scene' in cinema. The whole is created only once all the shots (parts) are perceived by the spectator. And this takes place in the same way as in music, that is, in time.

Balázs is keen to emphasise that what the spectator perceives is not reality but filmed material. He argues that in editing:

> what is done is not to break up into detail an already existent, already formed total picture, but to show a living, moving scene or landscape as a synthesis of sectional pictures, which merge in our consciousness into a total scene although they are not parts of an existent immutable mosaic and could never be made into a total single picture.[72]

The conception is of the whole in which each element of the spectator's perception (the dynamic principle of editing; the sectional pictures [shots]; the consciousness of the spectator) interact to create a total scene which exists only in the mind of the spectator. The dynamic principle is perhaps the element that governs the other two elements: it is through movement that the sectional pictures are merged in the

[69] Ibid. p.53.
[70] Ibid. p.52.
[71] Ibid. p.62.
[72] Ibid.

consciousness of the spectator. And it is due to movement that the total scene exists only in the mind of the spectator. The succession of shots creates the perception of the whole. The succession of 'sectional pictures merges in our consciousness into a total scene (...) as a whole in space.'[73] When Balázs writes about a 'scene' he is referring to it as a whole in space. In theatre the spectator sees this spatial whole, but in cinema this whole is imagined: it exists, then, in the mind of the spectator, regardless of whether an ES is shown or not. Balázs states this explicitly: 'The director [...] can, if he so chooses, make the spectator feel the continuity of the scene, its unity in time and space even if he has never once shown him a total picture of the whole scene for his orientation.'[74] This is because the whole is perceived as a result of the synthesis of the sequence of shots and not as a result of the breaking up into details of an already formed total picture, that is, the ES. It is through this dynamic element that Balázs reaches the conclusion that montage 'is the mobile composition of the film, an architecture in time, not in space'.[75] Film space is created and perceived temporally. In other words, the nature of film space is temporal.[76]

After analysing how the spectator perceives film space in a succession of shots, Balázs, perhaps implicitly making use of Husserl's concept of retention, goes on to analyse how the spectator perceives space within each individual shot, or more precisely, in the space surrounding each individual shot. In particular, he discusses how the spectator perceives a CU: 'If a close-up lifts some object or part of an object out of his surroundings, we nevertheless perceive it as existing in space; we do not for an instance forget that the hand, say, which is shown by the close-up, belongs to some human being'.[77] In other words, the spectator perceives the CU in a similar way to that in which a reader understands, a synecdoche. But Balázs states that the spectator did not always understand, the CU in that way. As with other editing techniques, the spectator had to learn to understand the CU, and this he soon did. Balázs argues, though, that the spectator's perception of a CU of a human face also involves different mental behaviour from that in the perception of a CU of an object. In a CU 'the face

[73] Ibid. p.30.
[74] Ibid. p.53.
[75] Ibid. p.52.
[76] Balázs's conclusions on film space recall Pudovkin's concept of 'constructive editing': 'the spectator is shown an incident, even sometimes an actor not as a whole but consecutively by aiming the camera at various parts of the scene or human body. This kind of construction of a picture, the resolving of the material into its elements and subsequent building from them a filmic whole is called "constructive editing".' Pudovkin, Film Technique, p.3. Though similar, Balázs takes the idea one step further by adding the element of perception.
[77] Balázs, Theory of Film , p.60.

has no relation to space or connection with it. Facing an isolated face takes us out of space, our consciousness of space is cut out and we find ourselves in other dimension: that of physiognomy'.[78] Balázs maintains, then, that the CU of a face has a psychological effect on the spectator which puts him/her outside space: 'The single features (of a face in a close-up) of course appear in space; but the significance of their relation to one another is not a phenomenon pertaining to space, no more than are emotions, thoughts and ideas which are manifested in the facial expression we see.'[79] What Balázs intends here is that, although the spectator is aware of the space surrounding the face (that is, that the spectator knows it is not a head severed from a body), he is so mesmerized by the physiognomy that space is irrelevant to his experience. Balázs uses the trial scene in Dreyer's La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc as an example of this: 'Fifty men are sitting in the same place all the time in this scene. Several hundred feet of film show nothing but big close-ups of heads of faces. We move in the spiritual dimension of facial expression alone. We neither see nor feel the space in which the scene is in reality enacted.'[80] We are not aware of the real space (again Balázs differentiates the real space from space which has been filmed), but we are aware of the film space. Writing about the panoramic shot (which for Balázs is in essence similar to a sequence of shots), he states that:

> in Dreyer's Joan of Arc, we never see the entire space in which the trial takes place. The camera, moving along rows of benches, takes striking close-ups of the heads of judges and by this uninterrupted panoramic shot, measures for us the actual dimension of space we do not see [...] we are conscious of space all the time we are looking at the procession of close-ups.[81]

Thus the spectator is aware of film space, but because physiognomy makes the spectator move in a 'spiritual dimension', the spectator finds space irrelevant.

This understanding by the spectator of the space surrounding a CU contributes to his understanding of film space in a succession of shots, even if an ES is not shown. Balázs's ideas, then, help us understand how the spectator perceives and understands a sequence of POV shots as used, for example, in the silent films of Kuleshov and

[78] Ibid. p.61.
[79] Ibid. p.62.
[80] Ibid. p.74.
[81] ibid. p.140.

Pudovkin. There, the unity of the sequences (which did not contain ES) was achieved mainly by the direction of the character's gaze, the eye-line match. Balázs goes further: it is not only the gaze that achieves the spatial continuity but several other elements which are perceived from one shot to the next by the spectator, above all sound. 'The continuity of a scene, its unity in time and space' are achieved not with the ES but:

> by including in every shot a movement, a gesture, a form, a something which refers the eye to the preceding and following shots, something that protrudes into the next shot like a branch of a tree or a fence, like a ball that rolls from one frame to the other, a bird that flies across, cigar smoke that curls in both, a look or gesture to which there is an answer in the next shot. But the director must be on his guard not to change the angle altogether with the direction of movement - if he does, the change in the picture is so great as to break its unity. The sound film has simplified this job of remaining in step. For sound can always be heard in the whole space, in each shot.[82]

An object or a character that 'moves' from one shot to the other contributes to the perception of film space as a whole. No ES needs to be used but the repetition of an element in both shots. Balázs does not state that the repetition of the element has to be done according to CS norms but it is implied. Following these norms regarding exits and entrances off and into frame does emphasise the perception of spatial continuity to create the perception of the whole. For example, there is a scene in Bresson's Mouchette (1966) where an object 'protrudes' into the next shot without the need of an ES, but instead following the CS norms on exits and entrances. In this scene, Mouchette ostracised by her fellow students, throws, out of jealousy and anger, mud at them. In one shot Mouchette throws mud towards the right of the frame. In the next shot the mud lands on the children coming from the left of the frame. If we apply Balázs's analysis, Visconti has a much more complex example involving both characters coming in and out of frame, the characters's gazes having responses in the following shots and the conversation that ensues between the characters which is heard throughout the sequence. The scene belongs to Rocco e i suoi fratelli (1960) (c.

[82] Ibid. p.53. Jan Mukařovský and Jan Kučera have a similar idea regarding the components of the shot which are seen repeatedly in adjoining shots. Kučera includes the tonality of lighting.

min. 36). The scene starts as follows:

1.MS of Simone entering right of frame to the showers. He goes under the shower on the left of the screen. Another boxer then enters also right of frame and takes the shower on the right hand side.
2.LS of corridor. Rocco runs towards the camera and the left side of the frame, before he exits the frame left cut to
3.Cont. of 1. Rocco enters frame right. He stays in the shower on the right.
4.Cont. of 2. The manager walks along the corridor, towards the camera and the left side of the frame (same path as Rocco in 2). His gaze is leftwards. The boxer in shot 1 enters frame left, passes the manager, looks at him, and walks along the corridor to the background.
5.Cont of 1. Simone and Rocco. Both look right.
6.MCU of manager. He looks left of the frame. PAN left following the manager which ends in a CU. He asks Simone how old he is.
7.MCU of Simone and Rocco, both looking right of the frame. Simone answers that he is twenty one. The manager, in voice off, asks him is he has a job. Simone answers that he has been fired.
8.Cont of 6.
9.CU of Rocco. Looking right (towards the manager) and then left (towards his brother). He follows the conversation between his brother and the boxing manager.
10.Cu of Simone. Looking obliquely right (towards manager) then right (towards Rocco).
11.Cont of 6.

No ES is present in this scene. The spatial continuity is created according to what Balázs states: the boxer who enters the frame right in shot 1 then enters shot 4 left (protruding from one shot to the other). Previously Rocco had passed from the corridor to the showers between shots 2 and 3. Both characters then establish firmly the spatial continuity of the corridor and the showers where the dialogue between the manager and Simone will ensue. The dialogue is further spatially established by the eye-line matches from shots 4 to 11 between Simone and Rocco on the one hand and the manager on the other. It is sound, the dialogue itself, the final spatial element which supports all the rest in creating the film space of the sequence. Not only the

dialogue is heard between shots 4 and 11 but also, and in particular, the noise of the water in the showers. It is heard both in the shots showing the showers and in those showing the corridor.

At a practical level Balázs's attempt to understand film space, then, actively encourages and supports the absence of an ES shot in the creation of a spatial continuity. The ES is not a necessity for the orientation of the spectator but a choice of the director.[83] To return to the musical simile, one note by itself does not establish the melody.

[83] See quotation under n.15.

EISENSTEIN AND 'JUXTAPOSITION'

The central idea in Eisenstein's theoretical writings on montage is that of juxtaposition - the notion that by the juxtapositions of two elements (for example two shots) a third is created. This is not the same as the 'concept of the whole', but Eisenstein uses the concept of the whole to support his idea of juxtaposition and finally arrives at the concept of the whole as such in his later writings. The idea of juxtaposition is already to be found in the early 1920s when he writes about the montage of 'attractions' and is still present in the late 1940s when he writes about the 'general image' of a work of art. During that period the concept of juxtaposition, after an initial development, remains essentially the same. Juxtaposition is sometimes called 'opposition', sometimes 'collision' and even 'dialectics'. The development does not occur in the concept of juxtaposition itself but in its application to cinema, an application that has to accommodate the development of the medium, for example, the arrival of sound. Juxtaposition is, so to speak, the creative element in cinema since it creates first of all the shot and the theme, what Eisenstein calls the 'general image', of a work of art . Juxtaposition is the creative element used by the director and perceived by the spectator. Perception is the final stage in the creative process: the creation caused by juxtaposition takes place in the mind of the spectator.

Eisenstein never directly applied this concept to the creation of spatial continuity, indeed he never addressed spatial continuity directly. His ultimate aim was to convey ideas to the spectator. Nevertheless, Eisenstein's concept of juxtaposition can help towards an understanding of spatial continuity. Furthermore it 'explains' and 'supports' a style of editing in which spatial continuity is created without the use of an ES. I shall attempt to demonstrate that in this chapter.

Eisenstein's concept of juxtaposition originates from his concept of attraction. While still a theatre director, Eisenstein was interested in provoking emotions in the spectator by means of attracting, in a shocking way, his or her attention. His article 'Montage of Attractions' (1923), belongs to this period. In this article he states that an attraction:

> is any aggressive moment in theatre, i.e., any element of it that subjects the

> audience to any emotional or psychological influence, verified by experience and mathematically calculated to produce specific emotional shocks in the spectator in the proper order within the whole. These shocks provide the only opportunity of perceiving the ideological aspect of what is being shown, the final ideological conclusions.[84]

The word 'juxtaposition' may not appear here (or anywhere else in the article) but the concept is already starting to form. In the above definition Eisenstein implies a succession of attractions, since the attractions have to follow a proper order in order to achieve the aim of conveying ideological conclusions. The attractions, then, have to be arranged in a montage.

Eisenstein argues that he abandoned theatre and became a film director in order to reach the masses. He probably moved to cinema, though, because he felt that by means of the new medium he would be able to concentrate and increase the succession of attractions, thus intensifying the results produced by the emotions experienced by the audience. The tool offered him by cinema was montage, that is, the montage of filmed shots. Each shot becomes an attraction itself; thus Eisenstein is able to produce a theoretically limitless number of attractions.

In 'The Montage of Film Attractions',[85] written when he was already a film director, his definition of attraction differs slightly from that found in the 'Montage of Attractions'. An attraction:

> is in our understanding any demonstrable fact (an action, an object, a phenomenon a conscious combination, and so on) that is known and proven to exercise a definite effect on the attention and emotions of the audience and that, combined with others, possesses the characteristic of concentrating the audience's emotions in any direction dictated by the production's purposes.[86]

The essence of the definition as such has not changed: an attraction is what has an affective effect on the spectator. The idea of succession is still implied through the combination of the attractions. It differs from the previous definition, however, in that

---

[84] S.M. Eisenstein, 'Montage of Attractions' Selected Works, I, Writings 1922-1934, London, Bloomington,1988, p.34.
[85] Ibid. p.40.
[86] Ibid.

the element of concentration is introduced.

Eisenstein has introduced this element because of the dynamic nature of cinema. This dynamism lies, not in the movement within the shots, but in the succession of shots. At this point Eisenstein substitutes 'combination' for 'comparison'. 'For the exposition of even the simplest phenomena, cinema needs comparison (by means of consecutive, separate presentation) between the elements which constitute it: montage (in the technical, cinematic sense of the world).[87] It is this notion of comparison that leads immediately to the concept of juxtaposition:

> Whereas in the theatre an effect is achieved primarily through the psychological perception of an actually occurring fact (e.g. a murder), in cinema it is made up of the juxtaposition and accumulation in the audience's psyche of associations that are aroused by the separate elements of the stated (in practical terms, in 'montage fragments') fact, associations that produce albeit tangentially, a similar (and often stronger) effect only when taken as a whole.[88]

In theatre, then, the attraction is perceived as a whole (in time and space) but in cinema the attraction is split into shots - each shot becomes itself a concentrated attraction. Eisenstein would later cease using the term attraction, and instead, use only 'shot'. In other words, the notion attraction is absorbed into the shot. These split attractions are perceived by the spectator and retained in his mind. When subsequently the 'whole' is reassembled, it has a much stronger impact since the effect is achieved through association; that is, the effect is not a product of physiological perception but of a mental process. Perhaps what Eisenstein is arguing here is that a conceptualised event is not only seen but also imagined, and thus the experience is stronger. Perhaps, though, Eisenstein is only arguing that the experience is stronger because of the rhythm in the succession of shots.

The next significant development in the Eisenstein theory of montage is his analysis of Japanese pictograms, theatre, and poetry. He already mentions them at the end of 'The Montage of Film Attractions', but he explores them in depth in 'Beyond the Shot'.[89] Eisenstein has noticed that Japanese pictograms, the huei-i, function on

---

[87] Ibid. p.41.
[88] Ibid.
[89] S.M. Eisenstein, 'Beyond the Shot', in Selected Works, I, p.138.

the basis of juxtaposition and the accumulation of associations. He terms these huei-i as 'copulative' pictograms, in the sense that two combined (or juxtaposed) pictograms create a concept. When one pictogram representing an object couples with another pictogram representing another object, a concept is created. Each pictogram by itself produces an association (the representation of the object), but two associations produce a concept. One of the examples he gives is the combination of the pictogram representing 'water' with that representing 'eye'. The concept created is 'to weep'. This 'discovery' is important because now Eisenstein realises that the juxtaposition of two shots not only provokes an effect in the spectator but is able to convey something of 'another dimension': a concept. He argues that the combination of two simple pictograms is equivalent to the combination of two shots. That is, Japanese pictograms use the same technique as the arrangement of shots in cinema: montage. The equivalence, parity, of pictograms and shots is complete since both contain 'representable' objects. By this equivalence Eisenstein probably saw the solution to the handicaps of silent cinema as 'the combination of these "representable" objects achieves the representation of something that cannot be graphically represented'.[90] The spectator's involvement remains the same, since the 'concept' is never seen but created in the mind of the spectator after the 'clash' of the two 'representable' objects has been perceived.

The process then repeats itself at the next level. A concept can be juxtaposed with another concept and this coupling will create a further concept, and so on. This is the technique used in Japanese poetical forms: the haikai and the tanka. Each line of the poem is a 'concept', the juxtaposition of a series of 'concepts' (lines) will create a higher, greater concept. For Eisenstein each verse of a haiku is a montage phrase. Eisenstein, then, when applying his ideas on the haiku to cinema makes the analogy between a verse and a sequence, a montage sequence. The ultimate purpose of the 'concept', though, is to provoke a psychological and emotional reaction in the spectator; thus he returns to the term 'effect' of the previous articles.

It is in 'Beyond the Shot' that Eisenstein places the principle of conflict (of juxtaposition, of collision) at the centre of cinematographic creativity. It could, indeed, be argued that Eisenstein believes conflict to be the basis of cinema. He gives a list of conflicts within the shot. The one that interests us for the theme of this thesis is the

[90] Ibid. p.139.

'conflict between the frame of the shot and the object'.[91] This has clear consequences for spatial continuity. Eisenstein's theory led him to consider the Japanese method of teaching drawing:

> You have a branch of a cherry tree or a landscape with a sailing boat.
> From this whole the pupil cuts out compositional units:
> A square, a circle, a rectangle.
> He creates a shot![92]

He compares this to the Russian style of painting: 'Our school: the dying method of spatial organization of a phenomenon in front of the lens [...] The other method used by the Japanese is that of 'capturing' with the camera, using it to organise. Cutting out a fragment of reality by means of the lens.'[93]

The principle of conflict in this case the conflict between the 'frame of the shot and the object', enables the film director, then, to select from reality the elements he considers necessary. These elements would then be juxtaposed, would create a concept, and ultimately provoke an emotional or ideological reaction in the spectator.

Given the political background against which he was working, it is not surprising that Eisenstein accommodates dialectics in his theory. Indeed it may be that dialectics helped shape Eisenstein's theory. He employs such dialectical thinking in 'The Dramaturgy of Film Form'.[94] (In Jan Leyda's 1949 translation this article was entitled 'The Dialectical Approach to Film Form'.)[95] The absorption of dialectics is the last significant development in Eisenstein's theory of juxtaposition. It takes a definite form and will remain the basis of his subsequent theoretical writings. The Hegelian dialectical principle of thesis confronted by an antithesis, producing a synthesis, and subsequently this synthesis becoming a thesis which will be confronted by an antithesis and so on ad infinitum, is analogous, according to Eisenstein, to Japanese pictograms, whose juxtaposition produces a concept (synthesis); it is also analogous to montage, whereby one shot juxtaposed to another produces a concept. It can be argued against Eisenstein's analogies that in dialectics the process is clear: two elements

[91] Ibid. p.146.
[92] Ibid.
[93] Ibid.
[94] S.M. Eisenstein, 'The Dramaturgy of Film Form', in Selected Works, I. p.161.
[95] S.M. Eisenstein, Film Form, San Diego, New York, London, 1949, pp. 45-63.

opposed to each other produce a third which in turn is opposed to a fourth element producing a fifth and so on. But in Eisenstein's analogy the product of juxtaposition only exists in the mind of the spectator. How can it be then juxtaposed to the next shot? The next shot is juxtaposed in the sequence to the preceding shot and not to the 'product' (synthesis) of the two preceding shots. Eisenstein's answer lies in the principle of accumulation (perhaps influenced by Husserl's concept of 'retention'): the succession of shots and of the subsequent concepts are accumulated in the spectator's mind and there associated (that is, juxtaposed). Perhaps also, for Eisenstein the analogy was not to be taken literally. While in dialectics the opposition is bilateral, in montage the opposition can occur within a sequence of shots. The former makes more sense theoretically, but in practical terms the latter seems to be more viable. But then, it ceases to be dialectics. Be that as it may, from here on Eisenstein argues that every stage, every element of cinema is governed by the principle of dialectics.

First of all this principle is found (and Eisenstein argues that it is responsible for it) in the perception of cinematographic movement by the spectator. The movement that is perceived when frames, projected at a certain speed, superimposed on the eye's retina and is created by the 'incongruity in contour between the first picture that has been imprinted on the mind and the subsequently perceived second picture - the conflict between the two - gives birth to the sensation of movement, the idea that movement has taken place'.[96] He continues:

> Here we have, in the temporal sense, what we see emerging spatially on the graphic or painted surface. What does the dynamic effect of a picture consist of? The eye follows the direction of an element. It retains a visual impression which then collides with the impression derived from following the direction of a second element. The conflict between those directions creates the dynamic effect in the apprehension of the whole.[97]

Eisenstein, then, argues that there is a distinction between the perception of the frames and the perception of the different elements in painting, the latter being spatial and the former temporal perception. But Eisenstein is not entirely correct here since he is confusing perception with conflict. Indeed the conflict of the cinematographic frames

[96] Eisenstein, Selected Works, I, p.164.
[97] Ibid.

is temporal and the conflict within the painting spatial, but one cannot perceive different elements in a painting simultaneously. Eisenstein himself describes how the 'eye follows the direction'; in other words, there is a succession of impressions in time. That would mean, then, that perception is in both cases (frames and painting) temporal. Mukařovský, analysing how meaning is conveyed in painting states that is a process taking place in time:

> it requires time in painting for even a very basic orientation in the total semantic organization of the pictorial plane, let alone for the careful perception induced by an effort to penetrate deeply into the most intrinsic sense of the painted creation. Even in painting, therefore, single, partial meanings comprise the total meaning through a meaning-creating process occurring in time.[98]

Here Mukařovský is applying the concept of the whole as developed by Czech Structuralists. Eisenstein seems at this point to start incorporating the concept of the whole into his idea of juxtaposition. Nevertheless, his distinction between temporal and spatial perception leads Eisenstein to distinguish between spatial and temporal conflict and, towards the conclusion, that cinema synthesises (dialectics again) both conflicts. He calls this synthesis 'visual counterpoint'. On this occasion Eisenstein is clearly right in distinguishing two conflicts in montage. There is a temporal conflict in the change of shot itself; that is, there is a succession of shots, and there is also a spatial conflict in the change of content, or rather of composition, within the shot. What Eisenstein does not fully realize, though it may be said to be implicit in his argument, is that both conflicts are perceived temporarily. Balázs demonstrates this. Using Balázs's argument (see Theory of Film, New York, 1970) it can be said that it is the temporal perception that causes the spatial conflict. Eisenstein's example under 'graphic conflict'[99] (taken from his list of conflicts in the 'Dramaturgy of Film Form') can be used to demonstrate this point. The example can be simplified to its basic elements, to look like this[100]:

X = / + \

[98] Jan Mukařovský, Structure, Sign, and Function, New Haven, London, 1977, p.8.
[99] Ibid. p.167.
[100] see diagram on page 168 of Eisenstein, Writings 1922-1934, London, Bloomington, 1988.

There is indeed a spatial conflict in the above example, in that the lines within each of the shots on the right are different. But this spatial conflict will not actually be perceived until there is a temporal conflict, that is, a succession (a transition) in the shots. Both conflicts, then, occur at the precise moment when there is a cut, a shot change. This perception is intrinsically temporal.

With dialectics the development of the idea of juxtaposition has been completed, and remains the same for the remainder of Eisensteins's writings (although in his last work, Non-indifferent Nature, he substitutes the term juxtaposition for a more elaborate 'systematic unity of diverse components'.)[101] From here on Eisenstein applies his theory to (and supports it with) practical examples, which are not limited to cinema but include all the arts. Such is the case with his unfinished second volume on film direction.[102] In this volume Eisenstein's aim is to analyse how a work of art 'contains as an indissoluble whole both the representation of a phenomenon and its image; by "image" is meant a generalised statement about the essence of the particular phenomenon'.[103] This is the culminating stage in Eisenstein's dialectical process, which started with the juxtaposition of frames. Here the thesis and antithesis are the phenomenon and its image respectively and the synthesis is the indissoluble whole. Parallel to the dialectical process this volume contains ideas similar to those of Husserl, Balázs and the Czech Structuralists regarding the concept of the whole, particularly in Eisenstein's newly acquired emphasis in regarding works of art as temporal processes. This is most clear when Eisenstein analyses Lessing's Laocoön.

Eisenstein's idea of the image as a whole, falls out of the scope of this thesis. Nevertheless several studies are to be found in Towards a Theory of Montage that have an interesting application of his theory of juxtaposition. I shall discuss the following chapters from this volume: 'Montage and Architecture', 'Yermolova' and 'Laocoön'.

In 'Montage and Architecture', Eisenstein again analyses how the whole is created by means of the perception of sequential juxtaposition. In this case he is referring to a spatial and temporal perception, but unlike in painting (as he discussed

[101] See 'Introduction' by Herbert Marshall in S. Eisenstein, Nonindifferent Nature, Cambridge, 1987, p. xviii.
[102] Published in U.K. under the title Towards a Theory of Montage. S.M. Eisenstein, Selected Works, II, Towards a Theory of Montage (1937-1940), London, 1994.
[103] Ibid. p.4.

in the previous articles) or cinema where the perceiver (spectator) is static, that is, has only one angle of vision, here the perceiver is actually moving through the perceived space:

> Path [...] nowadays it may also mean the path followed by the mind across a multiplicity of phenomena, far apart in time and space, gathered in a certain sequence into a single meaningful concept; diverse impressions passing in front of an immobile spectator.
>
> In the past, however, the opposite was the case: the spectator moved through a series of carefully disposed phenomena which he absorbed in order with his visual sense.[104]

His first example is that of perspective. In particular, how perspective is achieved in the Acropolis. In neo-Classical (Renaissance) painting and architecture, perspective, or the intended perspective is achieved by situating the viewer at a specific point on the one hand and at the same time 'drawing' a series of imaginary lines towards an imaginary point (point de fuge). In the Acropolis, Eisenstein argues, that perspective, or the sensation of perspective, is achieved through the actual movement of the passer-by, that is, it is achieved in time. It is difficult to understand Eisenstein's argument fully and thus how he reaches his conclusions, but Eisenstein's main point is that each section of relevance (relevant, that is, in the creation of perspective) in the itinerary of the passer-by has been conceived as a shot. These 'shots' are then juxtaposed in the passer-by's mind and subsequently an idea of perspective (of the Acropolis as a whole) is created.

Eisenstein is here clearly imposing his cinematographic ideas on something outside the realm of cinema, but he is again placing the emphasis on time. Each 'shot' (in this case, each element of the Acropolis) fixed in space is perceived in succession while the passer-by is moving and subsequently the whole is created in his mind. In other words, the process is temporal. This same emphasis is clear in the rest of the examples in the chapter.

In 'Yermolova', Eisenstein once again applies his ideas to painting, to 'that secret of the fabulous mobility of the figures of Daumier and Lautrec', which he

---

[104] Ibid. p.59.

mentions in the Dramaturgy of Film Form.[105] He is applying his idea of juxtaposition to analyse how the perception of movement is created in painting. Movement for Eisenstein has a broader meaning which exceeds the limits of physical movement. Metaphors, concepts, and images are also movement in the sense that they are 'intraconceptual movement'.[106] In other words, what Eisenstein is here applying to painting goes back to the Japanese pictograms from 'Beyond the Shot'.

'Yermolova' refers to the portrait of the actress M.N. Yermolova, by V.A. Serov. Eisenstein divides the painting into four 'shots'. Each of these parts of the painting corresponds to a different camera position or view angle. The sense of movement, or to continue with Eisenstein's simile, the vertical pan of the camera, which is then transferred to the figure of Yermolova herself, is achieved because the viewer perceives all the 'shots' simultaneously in his consciousness. Here, Eisenstein is again arguing that simultaneity and succession coexist in time: 'elements are simultaneously seen both as separate independent units and as inseparable of a single whole (or separate groups within that whole)'.[107] I have already argued above that simultaneity is created by succession and, essentially Eisenstein seems to be maintaining the same thing. The exception is that in painting he is able to argue that simultaneity exists even before it is perceived in succession by the viewer, since the separate elements of the painting already exist simultaneously in the canvas. Eisenstein's argument is as follows: simultaneity already exits 'outside' in the painting; this simultaneity is perceived in sequence by the viewer; the simultaneity is then re-created, through the juxtaposition of the parts in the mind of the viewer and thus a sense of movement is created. In Eisenstein words: 'the simultaneity of the existence of the picture both as a simple whole and as a system of successively enlarging shots into which the picture breaks down and from which the picture is again reconstituted as a whole'.[108] He then applies his arguments to cinema, equating the pre-existing painting with the pre-existing reality which will be subsequently filmed: 'this is what happens when we progress beyond the initiations of single set-up cinematography.[109] It is a precise illustration of how in montage the elements into which an event is broken up are reassembled into the montage image of that event'.[110]

---

[105] See n.11.
[106] Eisenstein, Towards a Theory of Montage, p. 86.
[107] Ibid.
[108] Ibid. p.90.
[109] That is, a scene is shot and shown in its entirety from a single camera position.
[110] Eisenstein, Towards a Theory of Montage, p.90.

Eisenstein equates the event with the painting. But these are two different things, at least in terms of perception. Eisenstein is able to argue that succession and simultaneity co-exist because the viewer sees the whole painting and the parts of the painting in succession. But a film spectator never sees the real event. He/she watches the edited event, that is, the selection of the real event made by the director. In other words, the spectator only sees 'the system of successive shots'. These shots are part of a whole, but not of an already existing whole, as Eisenstein is arguing. This whole exists only in the mind of the spectator. It is not re-created but created after a succession of shots is perceived. It is because there is no pre-existing whole in a montage sequence that the whole is perceived in time, as Balázs, and in space and time as Eisenstein has been arguing up till now.

In 'Laocoön', Eisenstein again starts by analysing the creation of movement in graphic art. He states again how in the paintings of Daumier and Tintoretto, different parts of the figures' bodies correspond to different moments of a movement (the left foot is in position A, the left knee in A + a, and so on), thus creating the impression of movement in the viewer. He abandons, though, the idea that the parts are perceived simultaneously. He argues now that they are perceived in sequence. It is through his analysis of Lessing's Laocoön that he reaches this conclusion. Eisenstein is still writing about the temporal coexistence of the different components but these are not perceived simultaneously. They coexist in the mind of the spectator. Lessing provides Eisenstein with a quotation that suits him:

> How do we achieve a clear understanding of any object in space? First, we examine each component separately, then the connection between these parts and finally the whole. Our senses perform these varying operations with such astonishing speed that for us they all merge into one and this speed is, without question, essential for our conception of the whole, which is no other than the end result of the result of the perception of the separate parts and their inter-relation.[111]

In other words, the perception of the different parts is a temporal process and the simultaneity of the parts occurs after the perception has taken place.

In 'Laocoön' Eisenstein also differentiates between the real event and the

[111] Ibid. p.162.

filmed event. 'In cinema', he writes, 'we are not dealing with an event but with an image of an event'.[112] In other words, when there is no pre-existing reality; montage does not recreate a reality but creates a reality of its own, and in the words of Eisenstein, a purposeful reality: 'Only montage is capable of producing a purposeful image: not of recreating but of creating for a specific purpose the required image of the object or phenomenon'.[113]

Eisenstein also becomes aware of another element which helps create the whole. The viewer of a painting is conscious of the whole even when he is only perceiving a part of that painting. The mechanism is that of synecdoche. Regarding the creation of movement in painting 'by the law of pars pro toto, from the position of the foot you mentally extrapolate the attitude which the entire figure should be taking up at that moment'.[114] The viewer will perceive each part of the figure in sequence, each time being conscious of the whole figure at that precise moment of the action belonging to the part of the figure he/she is watching. Eisenstein then brings in the rest of his theory of juxtaposition; that is, each perceived part of the figure and each imagined movement of the whole figure are retained and juxtaposed in the mind of the spectator in order to create the whole, in this case, the movement of the figure.

A similar pars pro toto occurs in literature when the narrator depicts the actions of an object; once these are perceived by the reader, the reader creates in his mind an image of the object, even if the object itself has never been depicted. Eisenstein takes an example from Lessing, where the latter describes how Homer portrays the movement of a ship without portraying the ship itself. Eisenstein equates the depicted actions of the ship with the 'parts' and the image of the ship as the whole. With this idea of depiction in mind Eisenstein transfers the 'law' of pars pro toto to cinema:

> Galloping hooves, the rushing head of a horse, a horse's rump disappearing into the distance. Those are three pictures. Only when they are combined in the mind does there arise a visual sensation of a galloping horse. It is interesting that for the 'average spectator', as they say, those shots are also merged into one.[115]

---

[112] Ibid. p.133.
[113] Ibid. p.161.
[114] Ibid. p.111.
[115] Ibid., p.123. One notes the similarity to Kuleshov's montage creation of a dancing woman, each moving part (shot) belonging to a different real woman.

This occurs because 'by the law of pars pro toto every close-up conveys the idea of the complete action.'[116] Each picture of each of the parts of the horse is a close-up. Again, with each part the spectator is aware of the whole. Eisenstein argues that in this case, with each close-up the spectator is conscious of the whole of the action of the horse, but logically of the whole of the horse itself. When the spectator juxtaposes the three close-ups he creates the image of a horse galloping - and Eisenstein argues that this is psychologically more intense than showing the horse in full, or showing three full shots of the horse galloping. The importance of 'Laocoön', then, lies in the notion that when a spectator is shown a part of the whole he is aware of the whole to which the part belongs before the juxtaposition of other parts takes place.

This notion can be directly applied to the creation of spatial continuity in cinema. In fact, every stage of Eisenstein's theory of juxtaposition can be applied to the creation of spatial continuity even though Eisenstein himself never directly did so.

The aim of Eisenstein's theory of juxtaposition is to analyse the creation of a whole. For Eisenstein this whole is the general image, the idea behind the work of art, its purpose. This is sometimes embodied in the idea of movement. But this whole can also be space, a space created by spatial continuity and not by the inclusion of an ES in a sequence of shots just as movement is created where there is no movement (that is, in painting).

'Galloping hooves, the rushing head of a horse, a horse rump disappearing into the distance'. Eisenstein uses this example to illustrate how the whole of an action can be perceived in cinema, without the film showing the action as a whole. But these three shots, these three close-ups, also convey the space where the action is taking place, or rather, convey the space where part of the action is taking place. Thus the space contained in each shot is also partial. It can be argued, then, that just as through the juxtaposition of these shots the spectator perceives the action as a whole, the spectator perceives space as a whole without seeing the whole space, that is, without an ES. If one applies Eisenstein theory of juxtaposition to spatial continuity, then each shot, each close-up, carries with it a 'conflict between the frame of the shot and the object'; by means of the frame each shot isolates a specific space which is unique (to

[116] Ibid. Balázs argues similarly that the spectator is conscious of the space outside the frame of the shot; in other words, the spectator is aware that a head shown in a close-up has not been severed from a body.

itself), and which then, like the Japanese pictogram, 'couples' with the space contained, isolated in the next shot. Simultaneously, the spectator through synecdoche, is aware of the whole, even when seeing only part of it. In the case of space, that means, for example, that in a close-up, the spectator is aware of the space beyond the frame of the shot.[117] Juxtaposition exists, then, at two levels: the space within the frame and that beyond it. At the final stage of Eisenstein's theory, both spaces enter into temporal and spatial conflict with the surrounding shots, temporal in the actual succession of shots, spatial in the change of content and composition within the shots. These conflicts are perceived temporally by the spectator, which results in an accumulation and association in his mind; this creates the whole of the space, or if one wishes to put it that way, the ES.

Eisenstein does not seem to have questioned classical spatial continuity when desiring to convey spatial continuity - which was not always the case, one thinks, for example, of a film like October (1927). In his writings he even reminds s the reader of the need for an ES. In 'Pushkin the Montageur', he analyses some lines of Pushkin as if they constituted a montage sequence:

> Line 12 is a typical montage 'reminder' of the overall scene, inserted into a series of close-ups. It is both an aural [...] and a visual [...] reminder. This is one of those long shots that we should always remember to insert lest the series of close-ups lose their connecting links and become detached from the general ensemble of the scene.[118]

That seems to contradict his own idea of juxtaposition, the more so if it is applied to spatial continuity: the whole is not created by juxtaposition but by showing the whole in a long shot. Nevertheless, Eisenstein does use the ES when he seeks to convey spatial continuity. There are a few exceptions; for example, in Strike (1924), there is a scene (around minute 10) in which the workers who are preparing for the strike discover a spy. The scene starts as follows:

1.MS of water, a man jumps into it.
2.INTER-TITLE: preparations

[117] An idea similar to that of Balázs.
[118] Eisenstein, Towards a Theory of Montage, p. 205.

3.LS of anchor over water, men arrive swimming and climb onto it.
4.MLS of ropes, a man is seen among them.
5. LS of anchor, men sitting on it (those seen in 3), more men arrive swimming.
6. INTER-TITLE: carry on agitation everywhere
7.LS of men hanging from anchor (closer shot from 3 and 5)
8.INTER-TITLE: the owl in an awkward situation
9.LS of port (although it is not clear). Fades into
10.MS of 'Owl' coming out from the ropes seen in 4. He is looking towards the left of the screen. He disappears again in between the ropes.
11.Cont. of 7. The young man sitting in the main part of the anchor looks right and points to right of the screen and shouts:
12.INTER-TITLE: spy!
13.LS of boats, the port, men jumping into the water.
14.LS of ropes, 'Owl' coming out and retreating.
15.Cont. of 13
16.LS of men climbing out of the water onto a boat (their screen direction is towards the right of the frame)
17.Cont of 14. 'Owl' walks out of left of the frame.
18.LS of men jumping into the water from boat. Screen direction: leftwards.
19.MS of men jumping into the water.
20.CS of men jumping into the water. Only feet and legs are seen.
21.Cont. of 18
22.LS of ropes, 'Owl' in the foreground, walks towards the left of the screen and exists.
23.CU of leg going into the water
24.MS of man swimming.

In this scene there is no ES to show that the strikers and the spy share the same space; nevertheless the impression of spatial continuity exists in the spectator. This impression is created by shots 10 and 11.The spy is looking towards the left of the screen and the striker discovers him; the striker is looking and pointing towards the right of the screen. If Eisenstein's theory is applied here, it can be argued that it is the juxtaposition of the characters' gazes that creates the spatial continuity. One might add that Eisenstein's idea of juxtaposition is a valid way of explaining 'gaze' direction.

It is, however, not necessarily the juxtaposition of gazes that causes spatial continuity. In October (1927) - c. min. 16 - , for example, the spatial continuity is created by the causal juxtaposition of shots, in a way similar to some of Kuleshov and Pudovkin's experiments with the face of Mozzhukin, in which the actor's face 'reacts' to the preceding shot.

The first part of the scene is a series of extreme long shots of a Bolshevik demonstration. Suddenly a fast sequence of short close-ups of a machine-gun follows (each close-up, barely lasting more than a second; each shot has a different camera angle). Then follows a sequence of extreme long shots, long shots, and medium shots of the crowds scattering. Demonstrators can be seen falling. The sequence of close-ups of the machine-gun(s) is repeated several times, always followed by long shots of the crowds scattering and of medium shots of Bolsheviks falling. At no point do the machine-gun(s) appear in the shots showing the crowds, but the spectator understands that the crowds are scattering and individuals falling to the ground dead because of the machine-gun fire. The spectator understands that the machine-gun(s) are somewhere in the same square as the crowds. It is not important to know the exact location of the machine-gun(s) to understand the scene.

In practice Eisenstein's scenes with no ES do not differ greatly from those of Pudovkin or Dovzhenko, or even Dreyer. But he does provide us with a theory which could explain how spatial continuity works. This theory comes to similar conclusions to that of Balázs.

CZECH FILM THEORY: JAN MUKAŘOVSKY AND JAN KUČERA

The idea of semantic completion enters Czech film theory on the one hand through Czech Structuralism and on the other through the writings of Balázs and Eisenstein (and the reading of them made by the Czech Structuralists). The two key figures in Czech film theory who discuss semantic completion are Jan Mukařovský and Jan Kučera. Mukařovský does so only briefly, in one article, but it is probably here that Kučera encounters for the first time the 'concept of the whole' applied to the discussion of film editing. Mukařovský brings his Structuralist background to Kučera. Kučera, although not an official member of the Prague Linguistic Circle, was, however, close to it. As a student, Kučera had attended the lectures, at Prague University, of Vilém Mathesius and Otakar Zich founding members of the Circle; furthermore, he had worked with Mukařovský, Jakobson and Petr Bogatyrev (another Russian Formalist in exile in Prague) at the Československá filmová společnost (Czechoslovak Film Society).[119] In his introduction to Kniha o filmu (Prague, 1941), Kučera states that his aim is to discuss film as a structure: 'Na kinematografickou tvorbu hledím v smyslu strukturalistického pojetí uměleckého díla.'[120] Both Mukařovský and Kučera discuss editing, in particular its application to the creation of film space, without the use of the ES. Kučera, then, Professor of Montage Theory at FAMU, was the bearer of an 'Eastern European' line of study in film theory where the ES was questioned, that is, where the norm of the ES was broken. The directors of the New Wave, as students, were exposed, through Kučera, these theoretical studies.

Mukařovský, as far as I am aware, wrote only three articles on film: 'Pokus o strukturní rozbor hereckého zjevu: Chaplin v světlech velkoměsta' (An attempt at a structural analysis of acting: Chaplin in big-city lights), Literární noviny, 5, 1931,10; 'K estetice filmu' (On the Aesthetics of Film), Listy pro umění a kritiku, I ,1933; and 'Čas ve filmu' (Time in Film), Studie z estetiky, Prague, 1966. Only 'K estetice filmu' is of interest for this thesis, since it is here that he attempts an analysis of film space, and where he discusses his Structuralist 'semantic completion'.[121]

---

[119] See Jan Svoboda, 'Problém času a prostoru ve filmovém umění: prace Jana Kučery z 30. - 40. let', Film a doba, roc.37, 1991, pp.182-83. See also, Zdeněk Hudec, Filmové myšlení v teoretickém díle Jana Kučera (1927-1977), Acta universitatis palackianae, Facultas philosophica, Philosophica-aesthetica, 22 -2000, pp.69-85.

[120] Jan Kučera Kniha o filmu, p.10.

[121] These articles appeared together in Jan Mukařovsky, Studie z estetiky, Prague, 1966 and later in Jan Mukařovsky, Studie, I, Brno, 2000. I use the later edition. For these articles in English see Jan

Mukařovský divides 'K estetice filmu' into two parts. In the first, he writes about the notion of the 'norm' in art and more specifically about the role of norm in a new art like cinema. Mukařovský's ideas on artistic norms parallel Roman Jakobson's who writes, in the same number of Listy pro umění a kritiku, that a new art 'tvoří své normy, vlastní zákony a pak tyto normy sebevědomě přechazuje' (creates its own norms, its own particular laws, and then transgresses them consciously).[122] This is basically what Mukařovský states right at the beginning of his article: film is a young art 'jehož vývoj je ještě stále zneklidňován proměnami technické ("strojové") základny, se mnohem silněji než v uměních tradičních pociťuje potřeba normy, o kterou by se bylo možno opřít ať v smyslu kladném (tím, že se plní), ať ve smyslu záporném (tím, že se porušuje).' (whose evolution is disturbed in its technical ("mechanical") base [...] much more than traditional arts, film feels the need for a norm both in the positive sense in that the norm is fulfilled and in the negative sense in that it is violated).[123] Continuous technical development prevents cinema from developing conventions over a lengthy period of time as had happened in traditional arts and therefore the establishment of norms and their subsequent violation take place at a much faster pace in cinema than they had in older forms of art . In other words, Mukařovský seems to be arguing, on the one hand, that cinema is still searching for its own aesthetic potential and limitations, and on the other it is being offered new technical means which broaden the aesthetic possibilities of film. Each norm offers cinema a way of understanding its own aesthetics, and each technical advance offers the possibility of violating that norm and thus experimenting with new aesthetic possibilities, thus creating new norms, experimentation which in turn will be violated, and so on. Mukařovský sees art as a process in continuous development and therefore the violation of norms is an intrinsic necessity for any art since the violation itself is a development. The norm itself is necessary but it is taken only as a mere temporary stage in the continuous development, in the same way as a historical date is a mere transitory stage in history. Thus Mukařovský argues that aesthetic theory should not, indeed cannot, have a prescriptive role because of the transitory nature of norms. An

---

Mukařovsky, Selected Essays, Structure, Sign and Function, New York, 1977. I use this edition for the translations.

[122] Roman Jakobson, 'Úpadek filmu?', Film a doba, 1989, 2, pp.84-86, originally published in Listy pro umění a kritiku, I, 1933.

[123] Mukařovský, Studie, p.442. Mukařovský would later develop fully his ideas on the norm in the article 'Aesthetic Function, Norm, and Value as Social Facts', 1935.

aesthetic theory built on norms would be of a transitory value, and so should instead provide the necessary knowledge for the understanding of the practical possibilities of any given art.

> But one cannot demand of contemporary aesthetics, which has given up the metaphysical notion of the beautiful in whatever guise it comes and which views the artistic structure as a developmental fact, that it expresses the ambition to determine what should be. A norm can only be the product of the development of art itself, a petrified impression of the process of development. If aesthetics cannot be the logic of art, judging what is correct and incorrect, it can nevertheless be something else: the epistemology of art. That is to say, every art has certain basic possibilities provided by the nature of its material and the way in which the given art masters it. At the same time these possibilities imply a limitation, not normative as for example, in the sense of Lessing's or Semper's, who judged that art does not have the right to overstep its boundaries, but a practical limitation, in that a particular art does not cease to be itself even if it expands onto the territory of another art.[124]

Art itself, Mukařovský argues, creates its own norms based on its own technical possibilities and it is not the role of aesthetics, of theory, to uphold these norms, since they are merely 'zkamenitým otiskem vývojového děni'; that is, temporary. The art itself will continue its own development, will violate the 'petrified' norm. Any theoretical attempt to make that norm permanent would be futile. Instead, theory should understand how any given art functions, its possibilities and limitations intrinsic to the material and character of the art itself, what Mukařovský refers as the 'latent preconditions' of an art: 'To musí konat estetiku filmu: není jejím ukolem, aby určovala normu, ale aby posilovala záměrnost vývoje odhalováním latentních předpokladů.'[125] (This is the task of the aesthetics of film. It should not determine the norm but should reinforce the direction of development by exposing its latent preconditions.)

In the second part of 'K estetice filmu', Mukařovský tries to expose these

[124] Mukařovský, Studie I, p.443
[125] Ibid. p.444.

'latent preconditions' by attempting an epistemological analysis of film space. The first task of an epistemological analysis of film space is to identify the material under scrutiny. In other words, one has to ask oneself what film space is in order to be able to understand it. Like other theorists coming from different background to cinema Mukařovský starts answering the question in a negative sense; that is, he asks himself what film space is not, in what ways film space differs from space found in other arts. The first and most obvious comparison (and perhaps the most useful) is with theatre, since from the beginning of film space was commonly confused with theatrical space. The difference is that theatrical space is three-dimensional while film space is two-dimensional. Furthermore, theatrical space is real while film space does not, so to speak, exist: the screen onto which the images are projected is flat although at the same time it gives the illusion that there exists a space in depth, a three-dimensional space. Therefore Mukařovský concludes that film space is illusory space.

Mukařovský's next comparison is with painting, an art which shares illusory space with film: pictorial space, illusory pictorial space. The next question, then, is how filmic illusory pictorical space differs from a purely pictorical space, in other words, what makes filmic space unique. The obvious answer is movement, but not movement within the shot, the kinetic quality of the film image, but rather the movement from one shot to the other: montage. Mukařovský writes:

> The basis for film space is, then, the illusory pictorial space. But in addition to that, or rather over and above that, the art of film has at its disposal another form of space unavailable to the other arts. This is the space provided by the technique of the shot. When there is a change from one shot to another, whether it occurs smoothly or abruptly, the focusing of the objective or the placement of the entire camera in space is, obviously, always changed. And this spatial shift is reflected in the viewers consciousness through a peculiar feeling which has often been described many times as the illusory displacement of the viewer himself.[126]

Here Mukařovský is also suggesting that filmic illusory space is created with the complicity of the spectator. Changes (that is, movement) in real space are

[126] Ibid. p.444-45.

recorded by the camera, and when edited and projected onto the screen they are perceived by the spectator as if he himself were being displaced in space. Thus, Mukařovský emphasises the pictorical space already present (through the employment of the whole array of techniques 'borrowed' from painting - perspective, composition, and so on) in the projected image. Mukařovský, then, recognises the difference between real space and filmed space and also of the necessary role of the spectator in creating film space. The difference between real space and filmed space is not further developed, but the role of the spectator is. The spectator has also a role in helping create film space when perceiving a close-up. Like Balázs before him, Mukařovský argues that the spectator is aware, so to speak, of the space existing outside the frame. Thus the close up emphasizes the illusion of space, that is, of three dimensional space.

> The spatial effectiveness (of the close up) is achieved by the impression of the in completeness of the picture which appears to us as a slice of three dimensional space felt to exist in front of the picture and around its sides. Lets us imagine, for example, a hand in a close up. Where is the person to whom this hand belongs? In the space outside the picture.[127]

Furthermore, Mukařovský, like Balázs, understands the importance of the soundtrack for conveying a unity, a continuity, of film space. One single sound can be continuously heard in a sequence of shots. This single sound, then, allows for the impression of a 'simultaneous presence of film space' since at times the source of the sound would be visible in one shot but not necessarily in the preceding and following shots. Thus the spectator, who again plays an active role, must localise the source of the sound outside the frame of the shot he is currently seeing, when this source is invisible,[128] and then, Mukařovský omits to say, associate it with the shot in which the source of the sound could be seen. The spectator localises the sound back in the previous shot, that is, in his memory; and thus the previous shot is still present in his mind. Spatial continuity is thus created. It can work the other way around; a sound is heard in several shots and not until the last shot of the sequence is the source of the sound seen. Again the mind of the spectator associates the shot (sound) retroactively.

---

[127] Ibid. p.446.
[128] Ibid.

The best example of this is a conversation shot using a shot-reverse-shot technique when one of the interlocutors can be seen while the other can only be heard and so on. This technique 'arouses an awareness of the space "between" the picture and the sound.'[129]

This use of sound, however, does not of itself explain fully how spatial continuity works in a sequence. Mukařovský attempts to explain it by Structuralist methods, in particular by applying the notion of semantic completion to the film sequence. He first illustrates the 'problem' and he does so specifically referring to the absence of an ES (and by doing so he is also questioning one the norms of film aesthetics regarding the CS): by asking the question how a sequence can have spatial unity when no ES is shown.

> Let us imagine any scene taking place in a particular space [for example a room]. By no means does this space have to be presented to us in a full shot; it can be presented by means of hints alone, by means of a sequence of partial shots. Even then we shall experience its unity; in other words, we shall perceive the individual pictorical [illusory] spaces shown consecutively on the plane of the screen as pictures of the separate sections of a unified three dimensional space.[130]

Mukařovský is here applying Husserl's concept of 'contexture' to the film sequence as developed by himself. For Mukařovský a contexture is a temporal structure and it is perceived temporally. Mukařovský, then, by using the word 'postupně' (consecutively) already hints at the temporal perception of film space, although he does not develop this notion as Balázs and Eisenstein did. Mukařovský is more interested in introducing a linguistic analogy in order to explain spatial continuity:

> How will the overall unity of space be presented to us? In order to answer this question let us think of the sentence as a semantic whole in language. The sentence is composed of words none of which contains the sentence's total meaning. That meaning is fully known to us only when we hear the

[129] Ibid.
[130] Ibid. p.447.

> end of the sentence. Nevertheless, at the very moment that we hear the first word we evaluate its meaning in accordance with the potential meaning of the sentence which it is a part of.[131]

Mukařovský continues the analogy as follows:

> All this can be repeated about film space. It is not fully provided by any individual picture, but each of the pictures is accompanied by an awareness of the unity of the total space, and the image of this space gains definition with the progression of the sequence of pictures. Thus we may presuppose that specifically filmic space, which is neither real nor illusory space, is space-meaning. Illusory spatial segments presented in consecutive pictures are partial signs of this space-meaning, the entirety of which "signifies" the total space.[132]

This analogy had already been used by Kuleshov and Pudovkin and by the Russian Formalists, among them Roman Jakobson, who suggested that a shot corresponded to a word, and a sequence of shots to a sentence,[133] but it is Mukařovský who analyses the analogy in depth and develops it, reaching conclusions the others had not been able to offer. Film space is space-meaning. It is not real space and it has ceased to be illusory space. It is a space which exists only after it has been perceived completely.

Mukařovský's analogy has one limitation: it does not fully explain how the process of film space becoming space-meaning takes place. It merely states that it does take place. One can analyse the different roles each word has within the structure of a given sentence: a noun, a direct object, an indirect object, a verb and so on, and thus the meaning is gradually transmitted and perceived. One cannot do this with a sequence of shots. And Mukařovský does not. Mukařovský does not explain either theoretically or technically how, within a sequence of shots, space 'gains definition'. He has, however, understood through his linguistic analogy, and through his application of the concept of 'contexture', that each shot conveys information to the spectator and that the spectator perceives and analyses this information. Furthermore has also understood that the spectator retains this information and

---

[131] Ibid.
[132] Ibid.
[133] See Poetika Kino.

associates it with the information perceived, from the other shots of the sequence. All this is implied in the analogy, in the use of the word 'meaning': each shot conveys information and this information is assimilated. Through his linguistic approach Mukařovský recognises the spectator's ability to synthesise the information received from individual shots to create a whole, thus reaching similar conclusions to those of Balázs and Eisenstein, regarding spatial continuity. It is a conclusion which implies that no ES is needed to create spatial continuity. But while Balázs and Eisenstein attempt to explain it filmically; that is, they attempt to analyse what an individual shot should contain to provoke the mental process of the spectator, Mukařovský does not offer any such explanation. Jan Kučera tries to bring the technical and theoretical explanations of Balázs and Eisenstein together with Mukařovský's insights. Mukařovský's main influence on Kučera is to be seen in the latter's emphasis on the logic of images (the potential meaning of the sentence) to explain spatial continuity.

Kučera's ideas on montage are to be found in five of his works, Kniha o filmu, (A book on film, Prague, 1941), Základy filmové skladby, (Foundations of film syntax, Prague, 1948/1949); Zásady vnitrni skladby filmového obrazu, (Foundations of the inner syntax of the film picture, Prague, 1950); Střihové skladby I, (Editing syntax I)[134] and Skladba ve filmu a televizi, (Syntax in Film and Television, Prague, 1964, 2nd edition, 1972). Only the first work was published for the general public, two being published internally by FAMU (in collaboration with the state pedagogical publishing house, SPN) for its students of direction, one Zásady vnitrni skladby filmoveho obrazu, was intended for students of camera, and the last work was published for internal use by Czechoslovak Television. Except for the first work, Kniha o filmu, which is general, and that intended for cameramen, the other three deal specifically with montage, which Kučera terms as 'střihová skladba' (cutting/editing syntax/composition) or simply 'skladba' (syntax/composition).

Even in his first work, Kniha o filmu Kučera's approach to the norms recalls that of Mukařovský: 'Teorie není zákonem. To znamená, ze teoretické výsledky praktického tvoření v umění jsou podkladem pro dalši experimentování [...]. Teorie objevuje normu, umělec normu porušuje'.[135] (Theory is not a law. That means that the

[134] I have not been able to find any second part to this work. I doubt whether it exists.
[135] Kučera, Jan, Kniha o filmu, p. 66.

theoretical results of the practical artistic creation are the basis for further experiments [...] Theory discovers the norm; the artist breaks that norm.) The norms 'discovered' by theory encourage their violation by the artist, encourage him to experiment. Theory would then 'discover' new norms resulting from that experimentation which would be once again violated by the artist. This process may repeat itself ad infinitum. Kučera differs from Mukařovský in that he argues that the theorist 'discovers' the norm while Mukařovský argues that it is the art itself which creates those norms. Theory rather than discovering norms, formulates and interprets them.

Kučera, then, gives the norms as they are at the moment of writing but aware of the fragility and temporality of those norms he never imposes them (either in Kniha o filmu or, indeed, in the other works under discussion). As will be seen, Kucera repeatedly suggests the possibility of violating the norm, the possibility of doing things differently.

In Kniha o filmu, Kučera does not address spatial continuity directly like Mukařovský, but indirectly. What he says about continuity can also be applied to spatial continuity. In fact, it seems that when he writes about continuity, spatial continuity is implied. He analyses continuity (it is one of his main concerns) but from the point of view of meaning; that is, he asks how information can be conveyed to the spectator within a narrative by means of shots. And he analyses film space only towards the end of the work. He discusses how the illusion of three-dimensionality is created within the shot, rather than the illusion of spatial unity from one shot to the next.

Under the heading 'Jak se tvoří filmový prostor' (How film space is created),[136] Kučera considers how the sense of illusory three-dimensionality is achieved within the shot. It is created by means of techniques employed during the shooting. He starts by acknowledging the flatness of the film image and the limitation, or rather, demarcation imposed on space by the frame of the screen. Film space is always that given by the screen and is always finite.[137] Thus Kučera has no need to compare film with other arts to identify his material. Film space is what is found within the frame of a film screen. It is only through montage, he argues, that this 'space' imposed by the frame is broken. This violation of the 'imposed space' creates and supports the sense of three-dimensionality, as Mukařovský maintains. But

[136] Ibid. p.151-165.
[137] Ibid. p.155.

within the shot five basic techniques achieve this sense of three-dimensionality, two of them borrowed from painting: composition and the employment of light. The other three are the movement of characters and/or objects, the movement of the camera (Kučera, basing his theory only on montage does not seem to realise that this also breaks the 'imposed space' of the frame by producing, so to speak, an ever changing frame), and the use of sound. Of the five the most important is probably syntax/composition since it creates a sense of distance (and thus of space) between the characters and the objects within a given shot. This sense of depth already present in the composition would then be reinforced by the use of light; depending on where the director of photography places the lighting equipment, some elements of the composition would be emphasised, others underplayed, thus creating contrasts and homogeneous patches (just as in painting) and thus a sense of space. In the same way, the movement of a character or an object within the chosen composition emphasises the distances existing in that composition. This emphasis is also achieved with the movement of the camera. All this takes place in real space, which is then shot and recorded on the flat image of the film. Finally, sound supports the creation of space: the volume and nature of the sounds heard in a shot will help supply the sense of, for example, how large a room is. Kučera also argues that sound creates space outside the frame. He gives as an example a woman shouting, who cannot be seen in the image: the spectator would immediately locate the source of the sound in the space outside the frame (off-screen). Thus three dimensionality is created within the shot. Kučera only addresses how it is created outside the shot indirectly when discussing continuity. The basis for continuity is the shot. In fact, the whole film, its essence and meaning is based on the shot. The material to be studied is, then, the shot:

> The construction of a film originates, in my opinion, from its most basic elements, that is, from the shots which mutually re-evaluate themselves, have an effect on each other, backwards and forwards, influence themselves, and other shots, both those that are linked materially and those that only come later.[138]

From the beginning Kučera pursues a theory of film based on the shot, thus on montage, like Kuleshov, Pudovkin and the Russian Formalists. And like Eisenstein

[138] Ibid. p.10.

his emphasis is on how the shots interact among themselves, even retroactively. It is this interaction that creates meaning and thus continuity. At the beginning of the chapter on editing Kučera is arguing that the meaning exists in the relationship of one shot to the others,[139] a statement which shows a clear influence from Eisenstein's dialectical approach, as well as of Mukařovský's Structuralist analysis. Kučera's first montage example contains no ES:

> Let us take the supreme example of montage:
> Shot Y belongs between shots X and Z
>
> Shot X: a group of children playing on a lawn.
> Shot Y: one child from the group is playing with some building bricks.
> Shot Z: a young couple looks down and smiles.
>
> We compare the content of the first shot with that of the second as a whole and in its details. Shot X shows the situation in full, that is, where the children are playing, and shows the mood, that is, that the children are happy, and furthermore shows with what they are playing. In detail (shot Y) shows that particular child who is playing with bricks.
>
> Shot Y must be the continuation, in content, of shot X: shot with similar lighting to that used in shot X, with the same out-of-focus background, for example, the tree behind the child.[140]

He continues:

> As soon as the child has knocked down the column of bricks, shot Z is shown, in which the two lovers smile, looking down at the child (who cannot be seen). The content of Y gave the content of shot Z. Here we have a clear example of how the content of one shot influences the content of another. Shot Z without the previous montage meant either nothing or everything [...] It is also a synthesis [...] We join shot Z with the images X and Y and thus we create a synthesis of content.[141]

---

[139] Ibid. p.34.
[140] Ibid.
[141] Ibid. p.35.

Kučera is arguing that shots interact mainly through content, that is, by means of information, meaning, through the logic of the images themselves. Indeed the continuity is also achieved through some technical aspects like the repetition of certain elements, the similarity of the lighting in each of the shots and the gaze of the lovers directed towards the lower part of the screen, but it is mainly the smile of the lovers that creates the continuity of the shots. The smile leads the spectator to perceive, believe, that the lovers are smiling at the child playing with the toy bricks, the way he knocks them down. It is causality, the synthesis of the meanings found in each shot, that creates the continuity. Here Kučera is himself synthesising Mukařovský's notions with those of Eisenstein. Similarly, when Kučera's example is applied to spatial continuity, this is created not by showing the ES but through the causality of the images the spectator perceives that the space shown in shots X and Y is contiguous to the space found in shot Z. And that space is achieved mainly through the smiles of the lovers.

Once more following Eisenstein, Kučera argues that this synthesis of shots is achieved by the spectator through the confrontation of those shots. Still using the same example, Kučera argues that the spectator will juxtapose the face of the child found in shot Y to the faces of the couple seen in shot Z.[142] Paradoxically, then, continuity is achieved through confrontation. With this statement Kučera is already laying the foundations for a style of editing that disposes with the need of the ES. Nevertheless, throughout the work, Kučera has based his ideas on the classical continuity style, but without prescribing it as normative. For example, he encourages the use of the match-on-action cut. He does, however, indeed encourage the use of the ES, stating that by seeing the whole scene (background scenery) the spectator can orientate himself easily.[143] Later, though, it seems that Kučera ascribes a descriptive role to the ES rather than an orientation role.[144] Only once in this work does Kučera stress the necessity of using the ES, and even then he offers alternatives. When writing about the uses of the close-up he states:

> It is not possible, of course, to express the action only with close-ups. (It is not normal. In special cases it is, however, also possible: art films often

[142] Ibid. p.36.
[143] Ibid. p.58.
[144] Ibid. p.60.

> use only microphotography and the director Dreyer shot a film about Joan of Arc, that was constructed out of only close-ups). Usually it is necessary to show a full shot and from it choose a particular element, a part, a detail.[145]

Kučera is not as conclusive as Mukařovsky but he is nevertheless aware that continuity 'works' without the ES. He prefers, however , the classical continuity style.

In Kniha o filmu Kučera's ideas have not yet been fully developed, in particular those regarding continuity. It is not until his next work, Základy filmové skladby, that he begins expanding his own ideas and those he had received from Mukařovský, Eisenstein and Balázs. In his introduction to Základy filmové skladby Kučera sets the tone of this work intended for students of direction at FAMU: question the norms, break them, experiment. Kučera's words recall those of Mukařovský:

> Film syntax developed mainly without rules. Directors and editors found ways of expressing thoughts or evoking certain impressions by chance, by improvising. With time some of these means of expression became common mannerisms, dead, conventional [sic] clichés. Bourgeois film practice depends on these mannerisms, on these clichés, on their mechanical and formal abuse and superficial alterations of them. We want to create a new art, truthful, innovative, sincere art, to create a true work of art, a socialist work of art.[146]

These words ideologise Mukařovský's words on film . The year is 1948. Leaving politics aside, this passage is of interest for my thesis, in that it encourages the students to question the Hollywood classical style, in other words, the norms that cinema itself had established to that date. And the students took it literally. In a conversation I had with Chytilová,[147] she said that her aim, and the aim of all the students who were to form part of the New Wave, was to discover the reality around them, and to make cinema to be true, sincere to that reality. To a degree, then, they

---

[145] Ibid. p.144.
[146] Kučera, Základy filmové skladby, p. i.
[147] Interview carried out to Vera Chytilová at FAMU on Feb. 2003.

were not being subversive but merely doing what they had been told to do. Ironically by questioning the norms of 'Western' cinema (norms which Socialist Realist films had followed decently, properly, without questioning them), by attempting to create a sincere socialist cinema (which Socialist Realist films had not attempted to) they found themselves a medium to question the socialist state where they were making those 'sincere socialist' films. I shall return to this in my next chapter. What I want to emphasise here is that Kučera's approach to film theory, is an approach based on practice and experimentation, and on Mukařovský's epistemological approach. In Základy filmové skladby, Kučera is offering principles and not norms, and these principles 'will be now in need of being tried out in practice and according to the result of these trials and in accordance with the development of progressive film making, it will be necessary to develop them and elaborate them.'[148] The aim of Kučera's approach is to know film art, to understand its possibilities, or in Mukařovský's words, its 'latent preconditions' and this is only achieved through a continuous mutual influence of theory and practice: a principle is formulated and then tested, and subsequently reformulated. This approach was passed on to the students.

From a purely theoretical point of view Kučera's approach in Základy filmové skladby is linguistic, its purpose being the analysis of the transmission of meaning by means of film editing. The basic element, he states again, of film is the shot and its purpose is to 'to express a thought'.[149] But a shot, in this case an image (obraz) is 'semantically unstable' when it interacts with other shots. Kučera's aim is to carry out an epistemological analysis of how the shots are linked, constructed 'syntactically' in other words, to understand and, therefore, control the meaning achieved through the syntactical process of linking, construction, that is, through montage. Kučera is still vindicating a montage-based cinema. Perhaps this is the only instance where he is being inflexibly normative: a long take, a plan-sequence, does not convey meaning. Only several shots bound in a sequence create a shot.[150] Thus the meaning of a sequence, and ultimately, of the whole film, is carried by what he calls 'soujev', concurrency (a phenomenon taking place simultaneously with another), in other words, a phenomenon running parallel to others. Here Kučera seems to be introducing Eisenstein's theory of juxtaposition whereby a series of shots create a

[148] Kučera, Základy filmové skladby, p. ii.
[149] Ibid. p.4.
[150] Ibid. p.12.

new idea in the mind of the spectator. Likewise, Kučera, seems to be elaborating on the Structuralist concept of contexture as developed by Mukařovský when he argues that the system or set (soustava) of several shots creates a phenomenon, editing, the succession of shots taking place on the screen. The concurrency, the 'soujev', takes place in the spectator's mind.[151] The 'soujev' contains the meaning of the sequence or indeed is the meaning itself.

Having reached this conclusion, Kučera then has to analyse how this 'soujev' is achieved from a technical point of view. He first discusses how a shot is created: through the choice of frame, camera position and camera angle.[152] These choices would affect the creation of the 'soujev' in that they select the content of the shot and thus the elements which will create the continuity and ultimately the 'soujev' itself:

> In each shot the constitutive elements (složky i prvky) are organized somewhat differently. Each shot, each 'soujev', represents, then, its own semantic value. Apart from this the components and elements of the 'soujev' are bound 'horizontally' from one shot to the next. By means of this binding of the components and elements of the 'soujev' new values are created, as Eisenstein says 'new things'.[153]

Kučera then divides the shot into elements and components. These are, for example, a character, an object, the background, the lighting, sound, and so on.[154] When these elements and components are repeated (not necessarily in the same form, but with variations, except for lighting which should be as close as possible the same as in the preceding and subsequent shots) in successive shots each of the elements and components creates its own order, each line 'horizontally' (as they pass from one shot to the other, similarly to the lines of a musical pentagram passing from one bar to the next. This recalls Eisenstein's 'pentagrams'). Each conveys on a minor level a signification, a meaning. It is when all these 'lines' combine, that is, are perceived simultaneously, that a system of parallel lines is created. It is these systems of parallel lines that ultimately create the 'soujev' in the mind of the spectator. The concurrency is created because of the conflict between 'lines' running parallel. At least two 'lines'

---

[151] Ibid. p.7.
[152] Ibid. p.12.
[153] Ibid. p.16.
[154] See also Kučera, Kniha o filmu, p. 34.

are needed to create the conflict, to create the eventual 'concurrency' and thus the 'dramatic meaning' of the sequence.[155]

This seems to contradict what Kučera had suggested earlier in Kniha o filmu, that continuity is created by the logic of the images themselves (the little boy playing and the smiling couple), since here he is suggesting that the meaning of the images is created by the continuity achieved by the systems of parallel lines.

Kučera appears to clarify this point in his next work, Zasady vnitrni skladby filmoveho obrazu, that was intended for students of camera. Here he gives priority to the idea, to the meaning of the shots, over their content. In other words, the idea is what creates the continuity, the components and elements are there to support the idea and the continuity but not to create them. The director has to impose the idea on the content:

> Single shots present the spectator part of the content of the whole image. Their partial content is fused into a wholeness of content. If by means of several shots we have expressed the whole of thought, a unity of content, we would have created a shot-construction. And on the other hand: if we have achieved the goal of binding the shot, fusing them by means of their content, we would have qualified the expression of the whole, that arises in the consciousness of the spectator.[156]

In any case, whether it is the logic of images or the 'configuration' that creates the continuity, that unifies the shots, once again Kučera is encouraging a style of editing in which no ES would be needed, if by nothing else than the fact that he does not write about it.

In Zasady vnitrni skladby filmoveho obrazu, Kučera states that he will discuss mainly the internal composition of the shot, the basic unit of montage. Nevertheless most of the work is devoted to the analysis of how the internal composition of the shot aids the creation of continuity within a sequence, of how the internal elements of a shot support the idea that unifies a sequence and ultimately the whole film.

He again starts by saying that one shot alone does not create a consciousness

[155] Kučera, Základy filmové skladby, p. 42.
[156] Kučera, Zásady vnitrní skladby filmového obrazu, p. 3.

of a whole in the mind of the spectator, thus already undermining the traditional role ascribed to the ES.[157] Likewise, when continuity is not achieved it is not due to a lack of ES but to the use of different clothes on the same character form shot to shot, or different speech, a different type and tone of lighting in successive shots, or the wrong rhythm in the editing of the shots.[158] Kučera seems, overall, to treat the ES merely as one more type of shot. He does write about it in this work, but he is never prescriptive about it. The emphasis is always somewhere else. For example, on the spectator: 'Naturally, the ability of creating associations, of evoking connections, is not a property of the shot, but rather of the spectator.[159] In a classically edited sequence where an ES is shown first it is the spectator who associates what he sees in the ES with what he sees in the subsequent shots, and in the same way it is the spectator who associates what has disappeared in the 'smaller' shots (medium, close-up, and so forth) to the ES. It is the active role of the spectator that creates the association and not the ES per se (due to what traditional Western theorists claim is the passivity of the spectator). Nevertheless the filmmaker has to help the spectator make those associations. It is here that Kučera introduces two new terms in order to explain how the shots are linked, those of 'shoda' and 'neshoda' ('concord' and 'discord' respectively). Kučera is here referring to and elaborating on Eisenstein's conception of juxtaposition of the content within a shot and the content of the previous and subsequent shots. He bases his views on examples using ESs, but, again, the emphasis is placed elsewhere.

Under the heading 'Vytýčeni shod a neshod v záběrech' (demarcation of concords and discords in the shots) he writes:

> Shots that are linked to one another are in part concordant and in part discordant, different. In one shot we see the whole of the room, in the next shot only part of it. Concord: some objects that we had seen in the first shot, are also to be seen in the second shot. Light, its direction, intensity, the type of lighting which illuminated the room is concordant in both shots. The direction from which we watched the room in the first

[157] Ibid. p.7.
[158] Ibid. p.15.
[159] Ibid. p.16.

shot, was retained also in the second.

Discord, for example: in the second shot we do not see several objects that we saw in the first shot: in the second shot a certain object , let us say a bed, dominates other objects, when in the first shot this bed had not attracted our attention.[160]

A further discord is the change in the size of the shot. Kučera here divides into concordant and discordant the elements and components of which he was writing earlier in Zaklady filmové skladby. He argues that is not only the repetition, with variations, of some elements that supports the creation of the continuity but also the discord of several of those elements. They support the creation of continuity in that they help the spectator to create it: 'From this pair (concord and discord) an embryonic impression of the room arises in the spectator and he/she starts to understand where in the room he/she should concentrate his attention.'[161] The filmmaker's choice of concordant and discordant elements, guides the spectator into knowing where he has to focus his attention.

In this example Kučera has chosen to make use of an ES (perhaps simply because the ES is the easiest to describe or envisage) and yet what Kučera is arguing works with or without the ES because the emphasis is placed on the concords and discords of what is being shown in the shots, and on how the spectator perceives them. It is the association of the elements made by the spectator that creates the whole.

Furthermore when considering what disorientates the spectator (like most theorists he places great importance on the need of the spectator to orientate himself/herself throughout a sequence of shots), Kučera does not mention the ES at all. The orientation of the spectator is achieved by following the rules of composition, the axis, and what he terms as the 'main direction, that is, the only direction of the gaze into the space.'[162] The rules of composition are those regarding the discordant and concordant elements. The rule of the axis (the 180° rule) is that by which the axis should not be crossed. Crossing the axis and changing the main direction would disorientate the spectator. On the other hand, the axis can be crossed if the main direction is retained. These norms, however, can be broken:

---

[160] Ibid. p.23.
[161] Ibid.
[162] Ibid. p.26.

> If, of course, in a sequence of shots there is some very clear, intensive unifying element, a person, a thing, a movement, whose objective concord is absolutely evident to the spectator, there is no reason why the director and the cameraman should not cross the axis and choose the opposite main direction [...] When the shots have absolute objective discords they may have other concordant elements, for example, sound, music, the (semantic) content of the speech, tonality, logical coherence.[163]

In other words, sometimes the logic embedded in the images themselves or in the soundtrack is sufficient to create a continuity in the mind of the spectator. This is reiterated: it is not only through the image that continuity is achieved but also, and even solely, through sounds and speech (through a narrator, for example). This reiteration again points towards the removal of the ES for continuity or 'orientation' purposes. Indeed, at the end of the work, Kučera himself suggests the possibility of editing without the ES.

> Someone might ask: what if one has the task of placing against each other two medium shots or even two close-ups of objects that are parts of absolutely different full shots (wholes). We do not however see these full shots. According to which full shot should we deal with them? [...] Each close-up belongs to its own respective full shot (whole).A close-up which has no full shot (whole), which is not present actively in its own full shot, is not a (thematic) close-up, it is a semantic whole.[164]

Kučera is implying that each 'smaller' shot belongs to, or rather has been framed out of a larger picture. Even when this full shot is not shown, the smaller shot has still been framed out of the full shot. The implication is also that the spectator is aware of it, that is, that the spectator remains conscious of the space outside the frame he is watching, but semantically, the part, the close-up becomes a whole;

[163] Ibid.
[164] Ibid. p.52.

indeed the close-up is no longer a close up in function, but a full shot.. Again Kučera is pointing towards the logic of the images themselves when he states that a close-up which does not belong to a full shot becomes its own full shot from a semantic point of view, the implication being that a series of these 'orphan' close-ups would be linked by the logic of the images themselves.[165]

The same emphasis on meaning is to be found in his next work on montage, Střihová skladba I: montage is the means through which the film director conveys meaning to the spectator. Once more Kučera states that the meaning of a single shot is flexible and vague since the spectator could find several different meanings in a single shot and not only that intended by the director. Therefore, the director has to manipulate the flexibility of the meaning within a shot to modify the flexibility of the meaning of the preceding and following shots. In other words, the film director conveys and controls meaning with a sequence, with the manner in which that sequence is edited. As in his previous work, Kučera argues that this 'manipulation' is achieved through elements which are classified into a hierarchy by the director and the cameraman. This hierarchy can be overt or hidden, but the hierarchy always contains an element that forms the nucleus and governs the rest.[166] The nucleus, will govern the linking with the previous and subsequent shots by interacting with the main element found in those shots (which may or may not be a repetition of the main element of the 'original shot'). Again, within one sequence there is one shot which is the 'main element' on which the others are dependent. These considerations certainly recall those of Eisenstein when he was writing about thematic montage based on the dominant shot.

This main shot of the sequence, this dominant shot, is not necessarily the ES. Kučera is once more questioning the norms, or at least he is not taking them for granted, in particular those regarding the orientation of the spectator, to which Kučera lends great importance. Kučera argues that an ES is indeed the easiest way of orientating the spectator, that is, the easiest way of maintaining a certain degree of orientative unity in space and time. But he also says that this is not a rigid precept. He argues that this orientation can be achieved through the use of shots of different angles and sizes when the sequence has a concrete order - 'určita soustava'.[167] It all

[165] Kučera does mention Dreyer in this context but only to criticise it from an ideological point of view.
[166] Kučera, Strihová skladba I, p. 20.
[167] Ibid. p.27.

depends on how the director 'composes' each shot in relation to other shots. At this point Kučera is being too general; perhaps he expects the reader to be familiar with his previous works. He again repeats the principle of 'concord' and 'discord' in much the same way as he had in previous works, and he again repeats emphatically the importance of maintaining, in a sequence, the unity of lighting, main direction, and soundtrack.[168] He makes no reference to the dominant theme in Strihova skladba I at all.

Strihova skladba I is the work in which Kučera specifically states that there are two ways of conveying space and time in film, two styles of editing by which to direct the spectator through filmic space and time: one, using an ES; another without doing so.

> If the composition/syntax by means of which we manipulate the spectator's idea of time and space is to be successful, it is clearly necessary first to express the space in which the action is taking place beforehand, in such a way that the spectator is well aware of distances. This is the basic syntactic condition. We know that in cinema it is possible to illustrate the size of space in two ways: deductively and inductively. The deductive way is based in that first we show the spectator the expressive space if possible complete, that is, in full shot, and only then, from that shot do we derive partial views of the space. In the inductive way, we develop the idea of space in such a manner that we choose a sequence of partial views of the given space and from this mosaic the spectator creates a synthesis of the idea of the space (in the end it is possible to emphasize it with a full view).[169]

With the inductive method, then, the spectator does not need an ES to create, or recreate, in his/her mind the space in which the action is taking place. At this point Kučera does not explain how this works. For that the reader has to refer to previous works and to the first half of Střihova skladba I. When analysed closely this passage contains or implies what Kučera had previously said about how continuity is created: by means of, first of all, the role of the spectator, then the role of the elements, the

[168] Ibid. pp.32-50.
[169] Ibid. p.67.

concords and discords, the 'soujev', the 'soustava', and so forth. What is more important, FAMU students in 1959 (most of the Czechoslovak New Wave directors started their studies in 1957/58) were actively being encouraged to choose between those two styles of editing, the deductive and the inductive: using the ES or not using the ES.

In Skladba ve filmu a televizi, Kučera brings together all his ideas on montage and organizes them systematically. Little is developed from previous works: Balázs's idea of the temporal perception of editing by the spectator is introduced and synthesised with Eisenstein's theory of juxtaposition, something Kučera had been doing unconsciously in the previous works. Also, throughout the work, the role of the spectator is given more emphasis: the linking of the shots, the continuity, takes place not on the screen but in the mind of the spectator. The emphasis concerning how continuity is achieved is also placed on the logic of the images: how each shot answers the question(s) created by the previous shot and itself creates new questions thus involving the participation of the spectator, who would expect to find the answers to these questions in the subsequent shots. Kučera still 'offers' and analyses (in almost the same words as before) the inductive and deductive styles of editing.

Most of Kučera's works were intended as textbooks for FAMU and they are the product of his lectures on the theory of montage. These lectures had a direct influence on the New Wave directors. In his textbooks Kučera is inviting transgression, the breaking of norms, encouraging students not to conform, to learn their craft imaginatively. Kučera, the theorist, was not a person whose responsibility it was to guard the norms but, on the contrary to stimulate the violation of these norms, since he believed that to be the natural way in which an art is developed by a practitioner. His approach, then, encouraged the students to experiment and develop their own styles. Furthermore, his lectures gave the New Wave directors access to a tradition of film aesthetics different to that found in the West, the tradition which comprises the ideas of Kuleshov, Pudovkin, Eisenstein, and Balázs - and to which the ideas of Mukařovský and Kučera himself must be added. This was a tradition of theory that was either misunderstood (in the case of Kuleshov, Pudovkin, and Eisenstein) or ignored (in the case of Balázs) in the West. It was above all a tradition

which analysed spatial continuity, which attempted to understand how spatial continuity worked, without being afraid of removing the ES. Within this tradition Kučera was encouraging experimentation. It is high time then to acknowledge Kučera's participation in the appearance of the Czechoslovak New Wave. If the New Wave has to have a 'father' it is not Otakar Vávra but Jan Kučera.

PART III

THE CZECHOSLOVAK NEW WAVE AND THE ABSENCE OF THE ESTABLISHING SHOT

THE CZECHOSLOVAK NEW WAVE IN CONTEXT

The Czechoslovak New Wave has to be placed within two contexts. One is the Czechoslovak context: the political and cultural contexts of Czechoslovakia between 1945 and 1963. I shall treat here in particular the literary context and its formal aesthetics, since it is perhaps in literature where the main themes of the times are to be found most prominently. The other main context is the cinematographic. With this I mean not only the Czechoslovak cinematographic context but more significantly, the aesthetic (stylistic) developments and debates, and subsequent experimentation, taking place in post-Second World War cinema worldwide (which started during the war, with, on the one side of the Atlantic, Citizen Kane in 1941, and on the other, with Italian Neo-Realism). Both contexts reflect aesthetic debates between what could be referred to as the realist and the subjective modes of style. These aesthetic currents were not always antagonistic, but quite often synthesized elements of both into one style. In Czechoslovakia, for example, this debate took place in literature where Socialist Realism (a Soviet politicised version of nineteenth century Realism and Naturalism) was reacted against during the late 1950s, by a strong subjectivization of the narration (without fully abandoning realist elements), mainly by adopting the Ich-narrator or in other cases by the use of a subjective Er-narrator. In Czech and Slovak cinema this opposition between Socialist Realism and subjectivity is emphasised by parallel debates taking place in cinema worldwide between realism and subjectivity of the narrative, which had its peak in the late 1950s and early 1960s, with movements such as the Free Cinema in England and the French New Wave. The Czechoslovak New Wave, then, participates of both debates.

In 1948 the Communists take power in Czechoslovakia. The arts become a priority for the Communist Party as a means to propagate Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist ideology among the masses (something which had been done by the Avant-garde of the 1920s and 1930s, for example the Devětsil group). One must not forget that Czechoslovakia was the only post-war country in the Soviet Bloc in which the communists were voted in. Artists are asked to adopt Soviet models, that is Socialist Realism. In literature it is writers of the Avant-garde who accept the task. The poet Vítězslav Nezval became Section Chief in the Ministry of Information and Further Education. It was mainly those writers who cultivated psychological realism before

the war who provided most of the Socialist Realist writers producing both novels and story lines for films. Socialist Realism had been already implemented in the Soviet Union since 1934 and these 'psychological realists' had already flirted with the 'genre' before the war. Now, though, they had official sanction. Václav Řezáč, Marie Majerová, and Marie Pujmanová, among others, are the most prominent of these psychological realists. Younger enthusiasts also join the ranks, like Milan Kundera, or Pavel Kohout, if only for a while. What these writers were applying were the 'loose' aesthetics proclaimed by Gorky and Zhdanov in 1934 at the First Writers, Union Congress of the Soviet Union. The 'norms' of the Socialist Realist novel (if there ever were a set of norms) contained elements of both nineteenth century Russian novel (mainly the objective Er-narrator and the Bildungsroman, elements which where politicised by Marxist-Leninist (Stalinist) theory, that is, Marxist dialectics and placing the novel's action within an historical context of progress, to the point that 'the climax in the [Soviet Socialist Realist novel] re-enacts the climax of history', that is, communism.[1] Socialist Realist 'norms' differ, though, from those of nineteenth century realism and naturalism in that the aesthetic aim is not the conveyance of 'simply an "objective reality" but to depict reality in its revolutionary development'.[2] In other words, Socialist Realism was the result of a special kind of 'subjective' realism, where the revolutionary subjectivity of both authors and characters were imposed on reality, a portrayal of what 'reality ought to be' as Antonin Lunacharsky stated in 1933.[3] The main character of the Socialist novel is a positive hero , but one who has been deindividualised, recalling, as Katerina Clark states, elements of hagiography.[4] Furthermore, the aim of the positive hero is the creation of a collective and not individual identity. Thus the Socialist Realist novel is a sort of Bildungsroman where what is constructed is not as individual but a collective.[5] The positive hero is normally initiated into the collective aim by an elder (a party member of proletarian origin) just as in 'tribal' initiations.[6] A second stage in the Soviet Socialist Realist novel is the Production novel where collectivization of society is portrayed through a microcosm, for instance, a factory, a tractor station, a collective farm, and so on. Here

[1] For an analysis of the Soviet Socialist Realist novel see Katerina Clark, The Soviet Novel, History as Ritual, 3rd edn, 2000. Most of the information I am using is found there. (Henceforth Clark)
[2] Entry on Socialist Realism in Richard Taylor, Nancy Wood, Julian Graffy and Dina Iordanova(eds) BFI Companion to Eastern European and Russian Cinema, , London, 2000, p. 219.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Clark, p.49.
[5] Ibid. p. 57 ff.
[6] Ibid. p.184.

the positive hero is sent by the Party to a factory, for example, to increase production. The task goes through a period of crisis, most commonly due to sabotage or lack of commitment on the part of the workers. But in the end, through the help of a mentor, the hero achieves the completion of the task.[7] This Socialist Realist aesthetics, this master plot, was fully imported and cultivated in Czechoslovakia roughly between 1948 and 1954 when the first reaction started to appear in Slovakia after Stalin's death in 1953. The so-called 'thaw' in Slovak literature began with Alfonz Bednár's Sklený vrch. Although it still contained elements of the Bildungsroman and topoi of the Socialist Realist novel, one main aesthetical change is introduced, and that is, the Ich-narrator.[8] The female first-person narrator of Sklený vrch is the first reaction against the collective identity proclaimed by the Socialist Realist novel. Bednár's Ich-narrator gave way in Slovakia to the '56 Generation formed by Vincent Šikula, Peter Jaroš, Ján Johanides, Ján Lenčo, Rudolf Sloboda, Antonin Hykisch and Jozef Kot (all contributors in 1956 to the periodical Mladá tvorba).[9] The '56 Generation was in part the result of the XXth CPSU Congress of 1956 and the events taking place in Poland and Hungary in the same year. What characterized this generation of writers was their subjective approach to narrative, that is, the inclusion of the subjective experience in the narrative, often by making use of the Ich-narrator, or a subjective Er-narrator. They were reacting against the 'norms' of Socialist Realism but also against the poetics of classical nineteenth century novels. Their programme of intentions was proclaimed in their 'Miesto manifestu' (instead of a manifest) in Mladá tvorba (1, 1956, p.1).[10] They were influenced by the noveau roman and by the French Existentialists. The writers of the 56' Generation thus were 'turning to the individual, and his or her everyday life.'[11] On the Czech side this re-individualization of characters is also found in 1956 novels such as Valenta's Jdi za zeleným svetlém, where the author makes use of a mixture of Ich and Er-narrators, and later, in 1958, Škvorecký's Zbabělci and Stýblová's Mne soudila noc, both of which have Ich-narrators. The individualization of characters is also found in the settings of the novels. Factories, tractor stations are abandoned and instead dark rooms are used which enable writers to create 'intensive studies of the [character's] inner lives'.[12] Whether by means of an Ich-narrator or a subjective Er-

[7] Ibid. p.255.
[8] See Robert Pynsent, Modern Slovak Prose, Fiction Since 1945, London, 1990, p.1.
[9] Ibid. p.71.
[10] Ibid.
[11] Ibid.
[12] Alfred French, Czech Writers and Politics, 1945-1969, New York, 1982, p.127.

narrator the main feature of these novels is that the events are not objectively narrated but 'viewed through the eyes of the chief character'.[13] This individualization coincides with the 'rediscovery' of Kafka in the 1950s. Kafka often employs the subjective Er-narrator . For example, in The Castle , the narrative is centred on K. The narrator is always describing what K sees, what he feels and thinks but he does not narrate what other characters see, feel, think. In most cases, the narrator's description of what K sees is preceded by the narrator mentioning K's eyes (recalling the cinematographic POV technique whereby a CU of the eyes of a character is followed by a POV shot of what he or she sees). The individualization of the narrative in Czechoslovakia was influenced by novels such as The Catcher in the Rye (1951) by J.D. Salinger and The Loneliness of the Long Distance Runner by Alan Sillitoe, both of which novels employ the Ich-narrator to explore the inner life of the main character.[14] By 1960 the Ich-narrator has become 'almost de rigeuer in modern Czech fiction'.[15] This subjectivization of the narratives, this individualization of the characters, was the means the Czech and Slovak writers had of questioning the reality portrayed by the official Party machinery, that is, the reality created by means of Socialist Realist aesthetics. But not only this, the use of the Ich-narrator went further. It questioned, the reality of the society the writers were living in, questioned what was being created by the Socialist state, that which 'ought to be'. The writers were questioning this reality, they were seeking to portray this reality without prejudice, dispensing with pre-conceived truths; that is they were embarking on a search for reality as if on a voyage into the unknown. This is what the Ich-narrator provided them with: uncertainty. Uncertainty was exploited as a reaction to the unquestionable dogmatism and certainty championed by the establishment. Daniela Hodrová, an active fiction writer during the late 1980s to the 2000s wrote of the first person (Ich) narrator: 'pravě 1. osoba přináší s sebou znejistění, relativizuje vypovídání o skutečnosti a skutečnost samou.'[16] The Ich-narrator questions, 'relativizes', reality, and invites the implied reader to question the narration of that reality. As the title of her book indicates Hodrová considers literature to be bordering chaos and to be reflecting chaos. One could infer that perhaps Hodrová also considers the reality narrated and searched for by literature as

---

[13] Ibid. p.122.
[14] See Henrik Birbaum and Thomas Eekman, (eds), Fiction and Drama in Eastern and Southeastern Europe, Los Angeles, CA, 1980, p.151.
[15] Robert Pynsent, Sex Under Socialism, London, 1984, p.10.
[16] Daniela Hodrova and team, ...na okraji chaosu...Poetika literárního díla 20. století, Prague, 2001, p.607.

chaos.

These formal developments in Czech and Slovak literature of the time were paralleled by political developments. In 1953 Stalin and Gottwald died. Stalin's death provoked a power struggle not only in the Soviet Union but also in the whole Soviet bloc. In Czechoslovakia the power struggle had taken place in the show Slánský trials. Gottwald was almost 'naturally' replaced by Zápotocký. With his famous 1956 speech Khrushchev sends signals to the satellite states favouring reform. But with the violent crushing of the revolts in Poland and Hungary that same year the conservatives in each of the CPs of the satellite states retain the stronger position. In Czechoslovakia there is, then, a small thaw after Khrushchev's speech, which stutters to start in April 1956 during the Second Congress of Czechoslovak Writers. It was a fragile thaw since the power struggle in the Party's Central Committee is also fought in the arts. Between 1958 and 1962 there is an offensive against writers who did not comply with Socialist Realist directives. By 1959 the thaw ends. But a new one commences in the Soviet Union. This gives way to a period of hesitation of the Czechoslovak authorities between roughly 1959 and 1963. In 1962 the second thaw arrives in Czechoslovakia symbolically marked with the blowing up of Stalin's statue in Letná.[17]

This tendency towards subjectivity of the narrative in Czech and Slovak literature of the late 1950s is also seen in the cinema worldwide, in particular as a reaction to the CS. In Part I of this thesis I have discussed how the CS had developed as a compromise between the objective narration of nineteenth century realist literature and theatre and the subjectivity provided by editing techniques (in particular POV shots). In the words of Bordwell, with the CS 'optically subjective shots become anchored in an objective content.'[18] It was a strange subjectivity since it was argued theoretically that the film had to be narrated from the point of view of an invisible and ubiquitous observer. That is, it was theoretically explained as the subjectivity of an objective observer. Pudovkin was the first to argue that 'the camera lens should represent the eyes of an implicit observer'[19] who was not taking part in the action. To this objective subjectivity of the invisible observer was added the subjectivity of normally one character of the film. The subjectivity provided by editing (POV shots) supported the individualization of one character, the main character of the film. In

[17] For the political situation of these years see Lubomír Doležel, Narrative Modes in Czech Literature, Toronto, 1973.
[18] David Bordwell, Narration in the Fiction Film, London, 1985, p.162.
[19] Ibid. p. 9.

other words, the narration was channelled through the subjectivity of one character. The spectator only gets to know what the main character knows and sees (by means of POV shots) what the main character sees. The CS was the merging of both 'narrative modes'. But the subjectivity within the CS was limited. Bordwell draws attention to an article by Herb Lightman, in which he discusses the uses of the subjective camera. Lightman states that POV shots 'must be motivated by and definitely linked to the objective scenes [shots] that precede and follow it'.[20] Thus the CS is put into practice during the 1930s, 1940s, 1950s and even 1960s, each film varying the degree of subjectivity or objectivity according to the needs of the story, that is, the number of POV shots per film depending on what the 'objective scenes' of each film motivate. Within the CS Hitchcock is the master of the subjective camera, with films such as The Rear Window (1954) and The Birds (1963).

In the late 1930s and early 1940s developments in film technology, mainly in the areas of camera lenses and film stock, caused the first major challenge to the CS. Lenses with wider angles and more sensitive film stock provided film makers with the possibility of making use of depth of field, sharper than ever before. This resulted in more staging in depth and more plan-sequences , that is, less editing. The new style appeared in films such as Citizen Kane (1940) by Orson Welles; The Stranger on the Third Floor (1940) by Boris Ingoter; All That Money Can Buy (1941) by William Dieterle; Meet John Doe (1941) by Frank Capra; The Maltese Falcon (1941) by John Huston; and The Best Years of Our Lives (1945) by William Wyler. Due to the war these films did not arrive in most of Europe until the late 1940s, but they did provoked a debate (centred on the French critic André Bazin) about realism, that is, cinematographic, photographic, realism. This realism was not understood as narrative objectivity but as photographic objectivity. At the same time, the idea of the (ubiquitous) invisible observer is questioned. In plan-sequences the spectator sees the action not from all angles (as in the CS) but only from one. Bazin argued that it was then the task of the spectator to choose what was important in narrative terms. It turns out, though, that these films which employ this deep focus style do not really question the CS nor the role of the spectator, since they maintain the same causality, albeit without editing. Instead of editing the narrative elements, these elements are staged carefully within the shot to guide the spectators attention through the causality typical

[20] Herb Lightman, 'The Subjective Camera', American Cinematographer, 27, 2, Feb 1946: 46, pp.66-67 in Bordwell Narration..., 1985, p.162.

of the CS.[21] Nevertheless, what Bazin was championing was the reproduction of reality by means of the photographic nature of film camera, that is, the 'absolute objectivity' achieved in the images by the film camera.[22] This debate had also been preceded in Europe by Italian Neo-Realism with its emphasis on the photographic objectivity of the image (again the search for reality). By stripping the image of any artificiality (the theatrical elements of the CS) the Italian Neo-Realists enhanced the verisimilitude of the image. At the end of the 1950s the aim of photographic objectivity is taken up mainly by the Free Cinema and the French New Wave (and in the documentary genre by Cinéma Vérité) but this time with a much more pronounced subjectivity in the narration. What has been referred to as the Art-Cinema of the 1950s and early 1960s, then, 'emphasises the objective verisimilitude and the subjectivity of narration/character'.[23] This synthesis of objective verisimilitude, as a reaction to the theatricality of the CS, with the subjectivity of the narration/character (which is already contained moderately in the CS) is achieved in this (so called) Art-Cinema by means of editing. The objectivity is provided by the quasi-documentary style of the images; the subjectivity is provided by the editing and the plot. More POV shots are used and the plot 'will confine itself to what one character knows; [this] character's knowledge matches that of the spectator'.[24] This is similar to what Hitchcock was doing, within a less realist style, in films such as The Rear Window. This may account for the huge influence Hitchcock had on the young directors of the French New Wave. The Czechoslovak New Wave makes its appearance at this precise moment in the development of film style. The New Wave directors emphasise the subjectivity found in the film movements that precede them by removing the ES (the most theatrical element in the CS). Godard also removes the ES occasionally in later films (first in 1962 with Vivre sa vie) but rather than emphasising the subjectivity of the characters, he seems to be emphasising the confrontation between characters.[25] For example in Vivre sa vie the scene where Nana prostitutes herself for the first time has no ES. In this scene Godard emphasises the opposition between the prostitute and the client.

At a more formal level the CS was also questioned during the early 1940s by experimental film makers . Such is the case of Maya Deren in the United States. Her

---

[21] For a discussion of how deep focus complies with the CS see Bordwell, The Classical Hollywood Cinema, pp. 341-352.
[22] Fransisco Casetti, Teorías del cine, Madrid, 1994, pp. 41-46.
[23] Bordwell, Narration..., p.204.
[24] Ibid. p.209.
[25] Bordwell uses the term 'friction', ibid, p.328.

then husband was Alexander Hammid (of Czech origins, his real name was Hackenschmid), an active member of the Czech film avant-garde of the 1930s, collaborating with Machatý in Erotikon [1930], and directing a number of experimental films, such as, Bezúčelná procházka [Aimless walk] [1930]). Maya Deren and Alexander Hammid questioned film continuity and the use of the subjective camera. Meshes in the Afternoon (1943) directed by both Deren and Hammid includes shots which seem to be POV shots of the main character (played by Deren herself), but cannot be since they show the same actress. These shots are normally preceded and followed by CUs of the actress looking out of the window. The film also contains shot-reverse-shot sequences where the female character is watching herself. Deren and Hammid are thus bringing into question the temporal and spatial conventions of the CS and with them the expectations of the spectator, who asks himself/herself if the character is watching herself and if so how is this possible, and perhaps whether it is a flashback or a dream sequence. The spectator questions whether the shots are continuous in time and space. This experimentation with film space is further explored at the end of the film where a male character is introduced. No ES is used to establish the spatial contiguity of the two characters.

In her next film At Land (1944), directed by herself but photographed with Hammid's help, Deren continues her exploration of film space much in the manner of Kuleshov. It seems that Deren is developing the experiments carried out by Kuleshov but rather in a more radical way. Like Kuleshov's 'creative geography', Deren's editing techniques create a filmic space which does not exist in reality. Deren, though, does not attempt to disguise the different spaces to make them similar. Rather, she purposely makes each space (each part of the spatial filmic whole) as different as possible. Thus the spectator perceives the spaces as both being clearly different but (paradoxically) continuous. The sequences in At Land show a woman (in an exterior location) looking off-screen right followed by a 'POV' shot of a long table with guests sitting at it. The table is seen in a clearly interior location. She is then seen crawling on the table followed by a POV tracking shot of the guests at the table. She is then seen repeating the same movement but now in some kind of forest surrounded not by the guests but by plants. The alternation of forest shots and interior shots is repeated constantly but the direction of the woman's movement is retained.

Deren repeats the same 'spatial game' in A Study in Choreography for Camera (1945) co-directed by Tally Beatty. A dancer in a forest on the right side of the screen

makes an arc with his leg from top to bottom of the screen exiting the right frame slightly . The next shot shows a living room . The leg of the dancer in the previous shot enters the left side of the frame following in synchronization the movement started in the previous shot. Again, in another sequence the dancer jumps out of frame, that is, out of one space (a classical portico of a building) to another (cliffs by the sea) maintaining the exit/entrance norm. With this technique Deren makes her dancer jump across impossible physical spaces. This is achieved partly due to the absence of the ES. Chytilová will employ and develop these techniques in Sedmikrásky.

Another director who experiments with temporal and spatial continuity but within the commercial film industry is Alain Resnais. He does so, like Deren, by experimenting with the subjectivity of the POV and the eye-matches, using the conventions and expectations created by those techniques to 'jump across' narrative times in cinema. He does so particularly in Hiroshima mon amour (1959) and L'Année dernière a Marienbad (1961) (and later in La Guerre est fini, 1966). Like in Deren's Meshes in the Afternoon, CUs of the main female character looking off-screen are followed by shots where the same character is seen. The latter shots are the first of a narrative sequence. Thus the spectator understands from the content that the sequence is a flashback. But it is a flashback where the subjectivity is emphasised (the flashback is per se subjective) since the first shot of the sequence which follows the off-screen gaze is technically a POV shot, a POV shot which thus introduces the flashback: the character is watching herself in the past.

Resnais takes the technique further in L'Année dernière a Marienbad. Here the two main characters not only watch themselves in a different time but are also being watched by themselves. That is, Resnais makes use of an eye-match across the narrative times. He thus forces the spatial continuity of two narrative times and spaces. This eye-match takes place around minute 80 of the film when the two 'lovers' in the 'present' (I refer to it as present for the sake of argument. This thesis is not the place to discuss this film in detail) look off-screen left and the 'lovers' of the 'past' look off-screen right. It is a three shot sequence, starting with

1. INT. CU of the two lovers.

She: It is not so easy.

He: I don't know.

She: Besides I am not so brave.

He: You can't put it off again.

She: I am only asking for a few hours, that's all.

He: a few months, a few hours, a few minutes, a few seconds more, as if you still had doubts about separating from him, from yourself. As if you were his shadow.

She: someone's coming. Be quiet, please!

(they both turn their heads off-screen left)

2. EXT. MS of both lovers, looking off-screen right. The camera tracks back to an LS.

She walks to the foreground still looking off-screen right.

She: Go away if you really love me.

(He jumps over the balustrade and disappears .)

3. EXT. LS of her husband approaching the camera. He is looking off-screen left.

The real narrative eye-match, so to speak, is that between the 'lovers' in shot 2 and the 'husband' in shot 3, but for a while the spectator's expectations are tricked and it gives the impression that between shots 1 and 2 there is also an eye-match. This technique will later be developed by Jireš in Křik and Žert.

The Czechoslovak New Wave has to be put in the context of these trends in world cinema: the subjectivisation of the CS, the objectivisation of the image, and the formal questioning of continuity for narrative purposes. The Czechoslovak New Wave, however, was not only reacting to the CS but also to its Soviet 'variant', Socialist Realist films. Zhdanovite aesthetics were timidly introduced in the nationalized (since 1945) film industry in 1948.[26] During the three years between nationalization and zhdanovism the industry had mainly dealt with the country's most recent history: the Munich Agreement and its aftermath (Uloupená hranice [Stolen

[26] Nationalized in August 1945. See Hames, The Czechoslovak New Wave, p.32.

Frontier],directed by Jiri Weiss in 1947); the May 1945 uprising against the Germans (Němá barikáda [Silent Barricade], directed by Otakar Vávra in 1948); the return home of the soldiers (Návrat domů [Return home], directed by Martin Frič in 1948). Not much of the contemporaneous debates in the film world centred on realism, in particular on Neo-Realist aesthetics, can be seen in these films even though Otakar Vávra claims that he shot Němá barikáda under the influence of Italian Neo Realism. But except for the fact that he shot most of the film in exteriors, the over dramatic treatment of the events taking place in Prague in May 1945, the over acting of the actors trying to emphasis the heroism of the characters fighting the Germans, and the simplistic and patriotic script place this film far from Neo-Realist aesthetics and the ideas of Cesare Zavattini, theorist of the movement. In the Soviet Bloc it was perhaps in Hungary that the ideas of Neo Realism were most followed with films such as Emberek a havasou (Men on the Mountains1942), Valahol Európában (Somewhere in Europe1947), directed by Géza Radvanyi (co-scripted with Béla Balázs) and almost a decade later, Budapest tarasz (Spring in Budapest1955) and Egy pikkolo vilagas (A glass of Beer1955) both directed by Felix Mariassy.[27] This Neo Realist tendencies, this search for reality, also appear in the Polish School of the mid-1950s. The Polish School not only searches for new realism but also questions reality in a subjective way, in particular, in Andrej Munk's Czlowiek na torze (Man on the track1957). The film has three flashbacks each being the subjective version of the same event as told by three characters. That is, the events are narrated through the eyes of each character which recalls Kurosawa's technique in Rashomon (1950).[28]

In Czech cinema, apart from films with Second Word War themes or moralistic melodramas like Svědomí (Conscience), directed by Jiri Krejčík in 1948, it seems that the film industry already knew which way the wind was blowing. Between 1945 and 1948 a series of films already showed elements of Socialist Realism. Such is the case of, among many, Muži bez křídel, directed by František Čap in 1946; Ján Roháč z Dube directed by Vladimir Borky in 1947; or Siréna directed by Karel Steklý in 1947. This last film is introduced in the opening titles as a 'revoluční legenda z románu M. Majerové. Pravdivý příběh.' (revolutionary legend based on the novel of Marie Majerová. A true story). It is a period film set in the industrial town of Kladno during the 1880s. It tells the story of a working class woman fighting and suffering for her

[27] Antonin and Mira Liehm, The Most Important Art, p. 184.
[28] Ibid. p.165.

rights against the high bourgeoisie and her own violent husband. Dravci directed by Jiří Weiss in 1948, deals with a co-operative in a post Second World War town. The film industry was then attacked, once the Communists came to power, for producing films with too little Socialist content. Socialist Realist aesthetics peaks between 1950 and 1956[29] with most directors complying with the guidelines coming from above. Vávra directs Nástup, (The Battle-lines, 1953, based on the Socialst Realist novel of Václav Řezáč), Weiss Vstanou noví bojovnicí (New fighters will arise,1950, based on the novel by the Communist Prime Minister and later President Antonín Zápotocký), Vladimir Vlček Zitra se bude tančit všude (Tomorrow the whole world will dance,1952) scripted by the young Socialist Realist, Pavel Kohout, who became cultural attaché in Moscow when he was still an undergraduate, and later supported the Prague Spring and was expelled from Czechoslovakia. Zhdanovism was officially instated in an April 1950 resolution by the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party (a resolution similar to the Soviet resolution of 1946/48), which resulted in 'fewer films and more control' by the authorities.[30] Control which was even tighter after the Slánský trials of 1952. There was one film at the time that did not comply with the 'guidelines' (and perhaps even contributed to the authorities' decision to issue the 1950 resolution), Alfred Radok's Daleká cesta (The Long Journey, 1949). The film attempted to come to terms with what had happened at Terezin, the Jewish ghetto city in the Sudetenland. The film was criticised and banned. During the aftermath of the resolution, Václav Krška (Němec's future tutor at FAMU) also refused to give in, and he directed poetic and lyrical films such as Měsíc nad řekou (Moon over the river, 1955) and Stříbný vítr (Silver Wind, 1954), films which deal with individuals. Stříbný vítr was banned in 1954 and rehabilitated in 1956.

This situation where reality was being concealed by the veil of Socialist Realism lasted more or less until 1956 when Khrushchev decided to displace the Stalin personality cult. The result was a timid thaw all over the film industries in Eastern Europe. In Poland the Polish School flourished, in the Soviet Union The Cranes are Flying was shot. The mood of the XXth Soviet Party Congress is reflected in the Second Congress of Czechoslovak Writers, a mood which is in turn echoed in the philosophical journal Nová mysl where 'the artless copying of Soviet styles is condemned.'[31] A young generation of film-makers, some of them, the first students to

[29] Peter Hames, The Czechoslovak New Wave, p. 41.
[30] The Most Important Art, p.105.
[31] Hames, p.44.

graduate from FAMU, started to make films radically different from the Socialist Realist products. Vojtěch Jasný directs Zářijove noci (September Nights,1956) (scripted by Kohout) and Touha (Desire,1958); Ladislav Helge directs Škola otců (Fathers' school, 1957) and Velká samota (The Great Seclusion1959); Zbyněk Brynych directs Žižkovská romance (A Žižkov romance, 1957), Pět z milionu (Five from a million, 1958) and Smyk (Skid, 1960). The directors of the previous generation start also to make films with a different thematic. In particular there are three important films made by these directors: Tři přání (Three wishes, 1958) directed by Jan Kádár and Elmar Klos; Zde jsou lvi (Hic sunt leones,1958) by Václav Krška; and Konec jasnovidce (The end of a sorcerer) directed by Svitáček. The films were different from Socialist Realist films in that they dealt with real problems of real people, that is, the problems encountered by an individual in a Socialist state. These problems were approached with little or no schematisation. It was the first attempt by communist-period Czech directors to express reality as they saw it and not as it was meant to be represented.

Reactions from the authorities did not took long to arrive. In 1957 a conference of film-makers was held in Prague as a 'first attempt to reinstall a unified ideological line in Eastern Europe after the XXth Party Congress [and] the events of Poland and Hungary in 1956.'[32] But films made in 1958 lead to an even fiercer attack from the ideologues, peaking at the conference on Czech and Slovak films held at Banská Bystrica in 1959. Three films in particular were attacked at the conference: Tři přání, Zde jsou lvi, and Konec jasnovidce. All three were banned, Tři přání having its official premiere in 1963. 'Severe reprimands' were received by Helge for Škola otců and Jasny for Zářijove noci. These films broke with Socialist Realism mainly thematically, at the story level. On the stylistic level there was not much reaction against the CS. Zde jsou lvi, though, does contain several scenes without an ES. The absence of the ES is employed by Krška to emphasize the individuality and isolation of the main character. Krška's use of the non-ES technique precedes that of the New Wave directors. One can only speculate about the extent to which Krška as a FAMU teacher (and as film director) influenced his students. Again, Krška only employs this technique in Zde jsou lvi. The reason for his not continuing to apply the technique might perhaps be due to the strong attack launched against his film at Banská Bystrica.

[32] The Most Important Art, p.178.

Be that as it may, the counter attack launched at Banská Bystrica had only an short-term impact: it did not prevent Socialist Realist aesthetics from being abandoned altogether. Weiss directs Romeo Julia a tma (Romeo Juliet and the darkness, based on a novel by Jan Otčenašek) in 1959; Kreijčik Vyšši princip (A higher principle, based on a short story in Jan Drda's collection Nemá Barikada, see above) in 1960; Břynych Transport z raje (Transport from Paradise, based on a short story by Arnošt Lustig)in 1962. Frantisek Vláčil experimented formally with editing, questioning the CS in Holubice (The Dove, 1960). Vláčil's style of editing recalls that of the Soviet avant-garde of the 1920s, preceding and influencing the style of the New Wave directors. Indeed, to a certain extent Holubice paves the way for the formal break brought about by the New Wave. Němec, Chytilová, and Jireš shot their graduating films: Sousto (A mouthful, 1960), Strop (Ceiling, 1961) and Sál ztracených kroku (The hall of lost footsteps,1961) respectively. The so called 'miracle' of Czechoslovak cinema starts with the première of Stefan Uher's Slnko v sieti (Sunshine in the net,1962) followed by Chytilová's U stropu je pytel blech (A bag of fleas by the ceiling,1962) and O něčem jiném (About something else, 1963) and Forman's Konkurs (Competition,1963) and Černý Petr (Black Peter,1963). In 1963 a reorganization of production at the Barrandov and Koliba studios was carried out, a decentralization which had started in 1956 with the creation of autonomous production groups (tvůrčí skupiny). In 1963 there were five production groups in Prague at Barrandov (Felix-Brož; Novotný-Kubala; Sebor-Bor; Šmída-Fikar; Švabík-Procházka) and two in Bratislava at Koliba.[33] Their autonomy increased gradually and by 1968 they were fully independent[34] (only until early 1970 when they were dismantled). These autonomous production groups were the result of more tolerant times. They were receptive to innovation (in particular the Šebor-Bor group) and provided the basis for a second and more radical break with Socialist Realist aesthetics, that is, the New Wave. This New Wave, then, is influenced by previous reactions to Socialist Realism, the cinematographic and literary reactions of the late 1950s. Perhaps the New Wave is more influenced by the stylistic developments taking place in literature than by those taking place in the Czechoslovak cinematographic panorama, since formal experimentation in the cinema of the 1950s was minimal. More important were, in terms of influence, the developments taking place in the cinematographic world

[33] Micciche di Lino, 'Una generazione senza monumenti nel nuovo cinema Cecoslovaco', Bianco e nero, 1965, 9.
[34] The Most Important Art, p.275.

outside Czechoslovakia. And FAMU students were well acquainted with these developments. Czechoslovak Film Export was regularly approached by foreign distributors. These gave copies of films to be viewed and considered for purchase and subsequent distribution in Czechoslovakia. The films remained in Prague for two or three days, during which time they were shown to the students at FAMU. The formal experimentation, the questioning of the CS, contained in the films of the Free Cinema or the French New Wave, for example, had, to a certain extent, similarities to the first person narrators found in Czech and Slovak literature from the late 1950s onwards: the search for an objective reality by means of subjective techniques. It can be argued that the Czechoslovak New Wave took over these subjective techniques and developed them further.

What the New Wave directors had embarked on was finding a means to discover the reality that surround them. For example, Miloš Forman, in an interview with Joseph Gelmis in 1968, is quite emphatic about the quality of realism provided by cinema: 'Film is photography [...] and everything surrounding the actor is real. The sky is real. The trees are real. The earth is real. Everything is real. So I want real people too.'[35] When I interviewed Chytilová in 2003,[36] she also put much emphasis on regarding a film as a process of discovering reality, for the director and subsequently for the spectator. She makes a film because she wants to learn something ('chci se dovědět.') and represent it without hypocrisy but truthfully ('pravdivý'), without preconceived ideas about any reality, that is, without preforming the information but instead she lets the film reveal that information, an existent unnoticed reality. In other words, Chytilová approaches any film she makes uncertain of the nature of the reality she will eventually present. This is the same uncertainty which Hodrová talks about. Using an Ich-narrator in literature questions the notion of a search for reality and, indeed, the reality itself. It can be argued that the same technique and result is achieved in cinema by removing the ES.

Chytilová stated in the interview I had with her that editing is the technique of showing what is important and what is not. There is nothing unusual about that; every textbook on editing says the same. What is unusual is that Chytilová questions the capability of the ES to convey valuable information. Chytilová claims that the 'celek

[35] Joseph Gelmis, The Film Director as Superstar, Harmondsworth, 1974, p. 189.
[36] See note 146, Part II.

říká všechno a nic' (the ES says everything and nothing).[37] That is, the ES might give some information but incomplete information, and certainly not what is important. The ES might convey not only unimportant information, but might even 'lead us off the track, distract us from what is really important.'[38] That is, the ES might distract one from the process of discovering what one does not know. Chytilová even claims that the ES might disorientate the spectator. Indeed the implications for the spectator in removing the ES are important since it is not only the director who sets out to search for reality but also the spectator is invited (or directed in Chytilová's words) joining the director inn that search. Hodrová implies that the Ich-narrator provokes the implied reader to question the narration. This is exactly what the absence of the ES does, since the spectator is uncertain of the nature of that reality which he/she is observing; the spectator has to search for and create a whole reality from the parts he/she is shown. As I shall discuss below, Ivan Passer in Intimní osvětlení (Intimate lighting) goes as far as placing the spectator visually within the narrative space, the narrative reality of the film, forcing the spectator to understand that space, that reality from within the context of the film. Furthermore, the parallelism between the Ich-narrator and the non-ES technique can be drawn on a formal level. I have already argued that the CS was a synthesis of objective and subjective elements which had been explored in early cinema, and that the ES is the strongest objective element in this synthesis. I have argued that during the late 1950s there was a further subjectivization of the CS. Taking this further to a extreme subjectivity of the narration would mean shooting the whole film with the so-called 'subjective camera' technique, that is, shooting the whole film from the point of view of only one character which is never seen (which has been done, for example Chytilová's Pytel blech (Bag of Fleas), except for the final frames of the film where the camera turns round and the character is briefly seen). The stage before that extreme subjectivity consists in removing the strongest objective element, the ES. In other words, removing the ES bases the narration on the reflexive (subjective) use of off-screen space, on POV shots. The New Wave developed a partial formal subjectivity which emphasizes the individualization of the characters, as a reaction to the collectivism of a Socialist state.

[37] Ibid.
[38] Ibid.

CZECH AND SLOVAK FILMS OF THE NEW WAVE AND THE NON-ES TECHNIQUE

I shall now discuss the editing techniques employed by the Czech and Slovak directors of New Wave. Of the Czechs I shall consider as New Wave directors only those who having studied at FAMU during the 1950s and early 1960s began directing features films during the first half of the 1960s. These are: Hynek Bočan; Věra Chytilová; Miloš Forman; Jaromil Jireš; Pavel Juráček; Jiří Menzel; Jan Němec; Ivan Passer; and Evald Schorm. In particular, I shall analyse those films that contain scenes edited without the ES,[39] these are[40]: Strop, (Ceiling,1961),[41] Pytel blech (Bag of Fleas) (1962), Automat svět (Bistro The World, from the collection of short films Perličky na dně [Pearls at the Bottom][1965]), Sedmikrásky (Daisies,1966), and Ovoce stromů rájských jime (We eat the fruit of paradise's tree,1969) directed by Chytiliová; Konkurs (Competition, 1963), Černý Petr (Black Peter,1963), Lásky jedné plavovlásky (Loves of a Blonde,1965), directed by Forman; Žert (The Joke,1968), and Valérie a týden divů (Valerie and her week of wonders,1970), directed by Jaromil Jireš; Každý mladý muž (Every young man1965) by Juráček; Intimní osvětleni, (Intimate lighting,1965) by Passer; Smrt pana Baltazára (The death of Mr Baltasar, from Perličky na dně), Ostře sledované vlaky (Closely observed trains1966) and Skřivánci na niti (Skylarks on a string,1969) directed by Menzel; Mučedníci lásky (Martyrs of love,1966) directed by Němec; Pět holek na krku (Saddled with five girls,1967), directed by Schorm. I shall analyse two further films at the end of this chapter, Nikdo se nebude smát (Nobody will laugh,1965) directed by Bočan; and Návrat ztraceneho syna (Return of the prodigal son,1966) directed by Schorm, since these two films do make use of the ES, but in such a way that they shed some light on why there is such an unusual concentration of scenes with no ESs in the films of the Czech New Wave directors.

This was not only an unusual concentration in the Czech cinema of that period, nor even in the history of Czech cinema, but in the whole history of cinema. At the

[39] Antonín Maša, although being a fellow student of the above mentioned, systematically employs the use of the ES. For this reason I have left him out.
[40] Unfortunately I have had no access to their student films. Therefore I am unable to say at what point this technique started to be used.
[41] I give the production year.

time late 1940s, peaking during the 1960s when worldwide 'national film movements' were questioning the 'rules' of the classical film style, what differentiated the Czechoslovak new wave from the other 'movements' was precisely the absence of the ES. This absence, then, was, on the one hand, a strong reaction, within an East European context, to Socialist Realist aesthetics, and on the other hand, an equally strong reaction to the classical Hollywood style (in practice, paradoxically and again significantly, both sets of 'norms' were almost exactly the same, that is, as far as editing was concerned). This is not to say that the New Wave directors did not use the ES. They did, and quite often.

I shall not argue that this technique was unique to Czechoslovakia. In previous chapters I have looked examples from films by Kuleshov, Pudovkin, Dovzhenko, Eisenstein, Dreyer, and Romm. Within the classical style someone like John Ford occasionally uses the technique, for example in Rio Grande (1950) and The Quiet Man (1952). In the French New Wave, Godard uses it rarely, for example in Vivre sa vie (1962). Within the pre-New Wave Czech context, three films have scenes with no ES: Advent (1956) directed by Vladimir Vlček and Štenata (Pups,1957) directed by Ivo Novák. Interestingly enough the latter had Miloš Forman as script-writer and assistant director. My third example has already been discussed, Krška in Zde jsou lvi, which employs the non-ES technique extensively. I shall maintain, however, that the sheer concentration of scenes with no ES in the Czechoslovak New Wave films makes the 'non-ES' technique the main characteristic to distinguish the Czechoslovak New Wave from other movements in the same period.

In this chapter, I shall discuss how space is conveyed in these scenes and to what extent a spatial unity of any given scene is perceived by the spectator, that is, how the spatial orientation of the spectator is achieved for narrative purposes. I shall discuss how, by means of this 'non-ES' technique, some of the New Wave directors approached narrative time in an original way.

It is with Chytilová's U stropu je pytel blech (1963) that the absence of the ES can be noticed for the first time in the New Wave films. The film consists of two medium length films (c.40 minutes each), Strop, Chytilová's final year film at FAMU, and Pytel blech.

Like many others in the New Wave, it is a film where the technique of the reflexive use of off-screen space (to use Noel Burch's term)[42] constitutes the basis for its construction. In Strop there are three scenes with no ES and five where the ES is not clear cut. It is also a film in which the use of the close-up predominates. In Pytel blech, Chytilová gives the technique a twist and shoots the entire film (except for the last frames of the last shot of the film) as a reflexive view of a character (a POV shot with a subjective camera) whom the spectator sees only at the end of the film; it is a film shot conventionally (that is, with full shots of the scenes cutting back and forth to details of that full shot whenever the narrative demands it) except that all shots are POV shots of a character the spectator does not see.

In first scene of Strop after the credit titles the ES is already absent, which helps Chytilová introduce the main theme of the film, the isolation felt by a young woman who is questioning her current life working as a model. The scene starts with

1. ECU of blond hair. The hands of a hairdresser can be seen. Whistling can be heard.
2. ECU of Marta. The same hands can be seen . The same whistling.
3. ECU of Marta. The hands are combing her hair A voice can be heard commenting on her hair-style.
4. ECU of Marta. The hands combing her hair, the voice commenting on her hair-style.
5. ECU of Marta's profile. Hands combing, voice commenting on hair-style.
6. ECU of Marta. Hairdresser's hands. The voice criticises her old-fashioned style.
7. ECU of Marta. Hairdresser's hands. Same voice merely gossiping.
8. MS of a boy. In the foreground: out of focus blond hair and hands. Same voice singing.
9. MS of women having their hair dried. PAN right shows a woman looking off-screen right.
10. ECU of Marta. Hairdresser's hands. PAN left and TRACK right to the opposite angle of Marta as she laughs at what the hairdresser is telling her.
11. ECU of an old woman. She is looking off-screen right.
12. ECU of Marta.
13. CU of a woman looking off-screen right. Another woman, out of focus in the

[42] Noel Burch, Theory of Practice, London, 1973.

foreground, asks her: 'Do you know who's sitting there?'.

14. CMS of Marta and hairdresser.

15. Cont. of 13. The woman says she wants the same hairstyle.

16. Cont. of 14. Marta stands up.

17. MS of the till. TILT up to Marta as she pays. PAN left shows four women sitting in the waiting area.

There is no ES in this scene; nevertheless the spectator perceives the spatial unity of the place; that is, the spectator perceives that all the characters in the scene are at the same hairdressing saloon. The scene starts with a series of seven extreme close-ups of Marta, the film's main character. In these extreme close-ups several elements are repeated from shot to shot, these being Marta's hair and face (except for the first shot where we see only her hair), the hairdresser's hands and the type and style of lighting. What is more important is the repetition of the elements in the soundtrack: the noises coming from the machines in the hairdressing salon, the whistling, first, of the hairdresser, then his gossip, and even his singing. These aural elements are in part responsible for the spatial unity of the scene, since they are heard both in the shots where Marta and the hairdresser are shown and in those shots where they are not shown. Thus the spectator associates the sounds heard in the shots where Marta does not appear with those where she does, and that creates a continuous and contiguous space, in a word, a whole. This unity is emphasised by the gaze of the women (shots 9, 11, 13, and 15). They are looking off-screen right. Each time one of these shots is shown, it is followed by a shot of Marta (shots10, 12, 14, and 16). Thus Marta's shots become the point of view, the reflexive shots, of the women. That is, the spectator perceives that the women are looking at Marta. Furthermore, the spectator recognises that Marta is to the left of the women. In this way the topography of the hairdressing salon is vaguely established, but only vaguely since an exact topography of the hairdressing salon is irrelevant to narrative. A final element in the construction of film space in this scene is the logic of the shots themselves, mainly conveyed in the soundtrack. At one point (shot 13) several women start gossiping about 'the blonde'. 'Do you know who is sitting there?' asks one of them (in Czech 'naproti', opposite, in front, which is more spatial). 'I want the same hairstyle', says another woman. In other words, the spectator understands that close to these women there is a 'blonde' having

her hair done gorgeously. Thus what has relevance in this scene is not the space -the narrative space- nor time, which is compressed to the essential minimum, but the introduction of Marta's character as an object of vision, of desire and envy. She is an isolated character who has become a mere object for the others. And Marta has become aware of it. This is the main theme of the film.

It is the story of a young woman who has abandoned her university studies at medical school to pursue a career as a model. The medium-length film takes place during the days (or weeks, or even months, the time lapse is not specified) where Marta begins to question her life and herself: the film shows her disappointment at the banality of being a mere object both professionally and erotically. Her lover, an important and powerful person (it is not specified what he does or what rank he has attained) is only interested in her sexually. Marta sinks deeper into her crisis when she meets a former fellow student. This meeting torments her with regrets about dropping out from university. This former fellow student has a friend, Pepík (played by Josef Abraham), who is fond of her and would like to try to help her to escape her superficial world. She finally decides to leave the big city (symbol of the 'evil' responsible for her 'downfall') and return to the countryside (symbol of hope, salvation, of proper morals and so on), to her village. The film ends with Marta on a train to symbolic bucolic spiritual cleansing.

The meeting with her old friend from university and with Pepík is shot without a full shot showing Marta and Pepík together. It is as if Chytilová, by isolating Marta from Pepík, is telling the spectator that even if Pepík (and Pepík's love for her, perhaps) can potentially 'save' her, she will not choose this path, that it has to be Marta's own work to achieve salvation. The scene starts with Marta walking through the streets. She is shown in long shots and these are inter-cut with POV shots in medium frames of passers-by. Her gaze and those of the passers by (from the subjective shots) match: she is looking off-screen right, the passers by off-screen left. At the same time, shown in cross-cutting, Pepík and Marta's old friend are seen attempting to cross a street where they should not, and are apprehended and fined by a policeman.

The build up to the meeting of Marta, her friend from university and Pepík starts as follows:

1. PA of Pepík, Marta's friend from the university and a policeman. He takes their names. Both friends leave off-screen right. PAN follows them.
2. PA of Marta inside a shop pointing at a tie in the shop window.
3. CU of Pepík and Marta's friend buying an ice-cream. TILT from the ice-creams to their faces.
4. MS of shop window (patisserie). PAN/TILT left to Marta looking at the sweets and cakes.
5. LS of Pepík and friend playing a joke on a passer by.
6. CU of Marta. She is walking to the left. PAN follows her. She stops at a crossing.
7. MS of Pepík and friend walking to the right. PAN right. Pepík exits the frame right.
8. CU of the back of the head of a traffic policeman. PAN to LS showing Marta crossing the road towards the left. Her old friend enters the frame right and touches her.
9. MS of Pepík walking towards the right, away from the camera. He turns round and looks off-screen left.
10. Cont. of 8. The old friends greet each other.
11. Cont. of 9.
12. Cont of 8. Old friend takes Marta by the arm to meet Pepík. They walk to the right. The friend points off-screen right. Both their gazes are off-screen right.
13. CU of Pepík. His gaze off-screen left. From his expression the spectator understands that he likes Marta.
14. CU of friend and Marta. She is looking off-screen right.
15. ECU of Pepík. His gaze off-screen left (towards Marta) and oblique left (to his friend).
16. Cont. of 14. The friend suggests they should go to the canteen. Both he and Marta walk leftwards. PAN follows.

Three main elements unify the space in this scene: first, the street (in fact it is Václavské naměstí [Wenceslas Square] in Prague) with all its visual and aural components completely surrounds the characters in each shot (if the scene were to be analysed following Kučera's method, the street and its components would be the dominant element in each shot and in the whole sequence); secondly, the matching of the eyes; and, thirdly, the friend, who is first seen with Pepík and then with Marta (that is, the friend is an element which repeats itself in each series of shots). It was probably

unusual at the time not to show three young people together in one single ES (particularly since youth seen as a collective was one the topoi of Socialist Realist aesthetics. Young people are normally seen singing, dancing, playing the accordion, enjoying the state of being socialist. One sees this, for example, in Zitra se bude tančit všude). But by not repeating the young people as a group, Chytilová makes the encounter between Marta and Pepík much more emotionally intense. Chytilová goes straight to the point eliminating any unnecessary space (and shots), to that tense moment when Marta meets her potential 'saviour'. This is a potential relationship about which since the ES is absent the spectator suspects that it will not materialize. Marta will continue to be isolated, will gradually withdraw inside herself. And perhaps Chytilová is suggesting that she needs to be alone.

The film ends with the same image of isolation which Marta is voluntarily experiencing. The scene takes place inside a train (which is taking Marta to her home village). This scene is joined to the previous scene - where Marta has been wandering till dawn through the streets - by a CU of Marta. Thus this shot, this CU, becomes a sort of 'hinge' shot. Marta has been walking (symbolically) towards the outskirts of the city. She is now in a park. The scene continues as follows:

1. LS of Marta walking from left to right of the screen. There are trees in the foreground and a wall in the background and a gate at the far right hand end of the wall. Marta heads towards it. She stops at the threshold of the gate. (Marta now has her back to the camera).
2. ELS of a wheat field. In the far background there is a line of cypresses. TILT upwards, until the line of cypresses is at the bottom of the frame (a la Dovzhenko, with most of the screen filled with the sky).
3. CU of Marta raising her head, her gaze off-screen right . She then turns her head to the left and back to the right.
4. LS of fields (inside a train, through the window). The movement of the train is to the right. The soundtrack carries the noises of a train moving fast along the tracks (these noises will be heard throughout the sequence of shots).At the end of the shot a voice of a boy can is heard.
5. CU of a boy, speaking (his voice matches that of shot 4). A hand and part of an old woman's face (the boy's grandmother?) are seen.

6. CU of Marta looking down obliquely off-screen left. The voice of the grandmother (who started to speak in shot 5) is heard.
7. LS of part of the train's wagon (INT). A girl and two other passengers are shown. Their gaze is off-screen right.
8. MCU of the boy together with part of the girl's (seen in the previous shot) arm. 'Cow', she says. The boy immediately looks off-screen right.
9. ECU of Marta. Gaze off-screen left.
10. CU of boy. Looks off-screen right. The girl enters the shot and moves towards the window and looks off-screen right.
11. CU of 'české buchtičky' (buns), the grandmother gives one (off-screen, her hand can be seen) to the girl. The girl's voice says 'Thank you' (part of her jumper can be seen).
12. Cont of 9. The grandmother's voice offers her a bun (bucolic symbol. Symbol of popular tradition and wisdom, of a simple life based on high moral princples). Looking off-screen right, Marta first declines the offer but finally accepts and eats the bun. At times she looks off-screen obliquely right, and finally obliquely down left (that is, to the children in front of her. By now the children have become a symbol of hope, innocence, and so on.).
13. CU of window. Rain. A passenger says that it is raining again.

Shot 3 in this sequence is the last shot of the 'wandering' scene. But it could be considered a 'false' first shot of the film's last scene, given the reflexive-shot technique. Shot 4 could behave technically as the reflexive off-screen space of shot 3, that is, the spectator perceives for a moment (he/she is induced to believe) that shot 4 is what Marta (in shot 3) is looking at. But this 'false' perception lasts only a moment, before the spectator perceives the internal movement of the shot and hears the noise of the train. The spectator immediately 'relocates' himself/herself to the interior of a train carriage. This 'hinge' CU (shot 3) becomes the transition shot between the two scenes; a transition which is immediate, and at the same time questions the traditional conception (both temporal and spatial) of what the spectator expects a transition from scene to scene to be (dissolves, fade in, fade out, and so on). Michelangelo Antonioni, in La Notte (1961) employs similarly a 'false' POV shot as a transition between

scenes.[43] The character played by Marcello Mastroianni, a writer, arrives home, and after enquiring about his wife, who is not in, enters his study. There too tired to work he lies (in MS) on the couch by the window, looking up out of the window, off-screen right. The spectator expects the next shot to be a POV shot of what Mastroianni sees. The shot that follows seems to show a wall (in a low angle camera) from a building close to the window where Mastroianni is lying. The composition of the shot is abstract. It is arranged in different shades and shapes, and there is nothing in the shot which would indicate, as a reference to the spectator, the size of that wall. The spectator only recognises the actual proportions of the wall seconds later when a small figure of a woman enters from behind one of the 'lines' of the abstract shot. The appearance of the woman in the bottom left hand corner of the frame makes this shot completely different. The spectator now perceives the shot to be not a POV shot but a high angle extremely long objective shot of the character played by Jeanne Moreau (the wife of the character played by Mastroianni). This 'hinge' shot, then, actually behaves like two shots: the first half of the shot is perceived as a POV shot and is the end of one scene; the second half is perceived as an objective shot that starts the subsequent scene. No causality exists between the halves of the shot, except that perhaps the spectator might perceive that the writer is thinking about his wife. Chytilová makes use of the abstractness inherent in the 'hinge' (subjective/objective) shot. In Strop, this 'hinge' shot carries the symbolism of one scene into the next. Shot 2, which is the 'real' reflexive shot of both shots 1 and 3, shows the countryside, the fertile fields, as a metaphor of a new life, or rather the proper life, of purging. And at the same time, the line of cypresses which is given predominance after the camera's TILT (in the next shot this movement is paralleled by Marta's head, which thus makes both movements equivalent) develops the metaphor into one of death (cemeteries are normally full of cypresses); perhaps this is a 'warning', what makes Marta take the decision to abandon her empty city life as a model. The spectator has had little time to separate both scenes. Even though he/she is aware that the two scenes have different locations and times, he/she has also perceived the shots as a continuous whole. This technique of using a CU as a 'hinge' shot will also be used and developed by Jireš, in Křik and Žert, and outside the New Wave proper, by Juraj Herz in Spalovač mrtvol.

Because of the elements employed by Chytilová in each of the shots (the gazes, including the oblique ones, the movement and noises of the train, the buchtičky,

[43] Bordwell, Classical Hollywood cinema

the voices) inside the train the spectator has a pretty good idea of where each character is sitting: Marta is by the window (back to the engine), opposite her is the boy and next to him (to his right) the grandmother; the little girl comes from the seats behind Marta. The unity of the space has been achieved. Marta is surrounded by simple, wholesome, good people, who do not treat her as an object, but as a fellow passenger. She is on the right path now. Nevertheless, she is shown individually, isolated within her own shots. The end of the film is thus kept open, posing more questions than it gives answers.

The absence of the ES provides (or rather supports) an interesting plot construction in Chytilová's next work, Automat svět. Based, like all the other works on Perličky na dně, on a short story by Bohumil Hrabal (one of Hrabal's collections was called Perličky na dně), Automat svět has three plots which gradually converge into one. Chytilová wants to keep these three lines of action separate at the beginning, visually and spatially. She divides the narrative space into two, and can do this by not using the ES. The narrative takes place in a two-storey bar. The building where the action takes place is never shown as a whole, but each of the two floors is shown separately. Upstairs a wedding party is taking place. Downstairs a woman has just committed suicide and an artist, apparently a regular, enters the bar to talk about his life with the barmaid. Most of what he narrates is shown in flashback, thus separating temporally (and spatially) his 'story' from that of the dead woman and the wedding upstairs. There is, then, already a formal individualization of the stories and their characters (the bride, the dead woman, and the artist).

The dead woman and the artist share the same space, that is, the space of the bar proper downstairs and its kitchen. Although there is no conventional ES in the sequences taking place downstairs , the space is well established since it is shown mainly through partial ESs (of roughly each half of the bar) together with PANs and TRACKs (normally in MCU or LMS) following the characters as they move around the bar (that is, the background showing the bar). These PANs and TRACKs normally cross from one half of the bar to the other (shown in partial ESs). The dead woman is found, hanged, in the lavatory, and taken by the barmaid to a table in the kitchen behind the bar. At one point there is a shot in which the bar is shown in the foreground and the kitchen in the background: the table where the woman is lying can be seen. Thus when the artist enters the bar and comes up to the bar, shown in MCU, the

spectator knows exactly where he stands in relation to the dead woman. It turns out that the artist has just broken up with his girlfriend. He also tells the barmaid how his girlfriend used to model for him when he was making some masks of her face. While he is recounting this, the images show, in flashback, a LS of a woman lying down on a table and having white plaster poured over her head. This is almost exactly the same shot shown previously during the coroner's examination of the woman's dead body. Both women are lying in identical positions, shot from similar angles, wearing the same skirt, sweater, and shoes. One has a white plaster over her face, the other a white cloth. The spectator immediately associates the dead woman on the kitchen table with the woman in the artist's studio, a woman who had broken up with the artist and then committed suicide. Thus it turns out that the dead woman and the artist were not only sharing the same narrative space but also the same story line. While one character (the dead woman) exits the artist's narrative line, another (the bride) enters. The bride so far has been in the space contiguous to that of the artist.

Automat svět starts as follows:

1. LS of a bride and bridegroom (with their backs to the camera, probably sitting, behind a steamy window. Outside it is raining.). The soundtrack conveys people signing and shouting, an accordion and some drums, altogether festive music.
2. LS High angle shot on the street. A man who is about to cross the street is almost knocked down by a bicycle. The soundtrack from shot 1 is still heard.
3. LS match-on-action shot of the man being almost knocked down by the bicycle. He crosses the street towards the foreground of the shot. PAN following him, closing the frame to CU. He enters the bar. Soundtrack from shot 1.
4. MCU PAN of the man crossing from the door to the bar. Soundtrack from shot 1.

After these four shots the suicide takes over the narrative.

The spectator perceives that the wedding party is in the same building as the bar, mainly because of the soundtrack (which continues to be heard throughout the rest of the narrative). The spectator further perceives that the wedding party is above the bar as a result of a 'false' high angle shot reflexive. It is false because it is not preceded or followed by any shot showing a character looking off-screen. The spectator has to provide the association that someone from the wedding party is

looking down onto the street, and Chytilová is aware that the spectator will associate the high angle shot with a reflexive shot, simply because the spectator is familiar with reflexive shots. The spectator is being led by the director to provide what is missing.

Three quarters into the film, when the artist and the dead woman have been already 'established', the bride finally enters the narrative space of the artist; she comes downstairs, but without the upper space being shown at all. The sequence starts as follows:

1. MS of the barmaid and the artist. Suddenly they both look off-screen right.
2. LS of stairs outside (seen from the inside of the bar through the window). The bride comes down the stairs followed by a group of musicians and some guests.
3. CU of the small food lift. The barmaid goes to the lift door, opens it, and takes out a tray of dirty tankards and glasses.

In the next shot the bride enters the bar. The perception that the wedding party was taking place upstairs is then confirmed by shot 2 where the bride is coming down the stairs. The detail of the food lift in shot 3 gives the spectator the impression that once the party has finished and the guests are leaving the upstairs room, the glasses used are being taken down by means of the lift.

Automat svět is a chamber piece where Chytilová has the narrative completely under control, showing only that space (to the millimetre) which is relevant to the narrative, at the precise moment when it is relevant.

In her next film, Sedmikrasky, Chytilová questions the very notion of the ES openly. This film has five scenes with no ES. The film is shot in black and white, sepia tones and in colour. It has no cohesive narrative. It is Chitylová's most formal experiment.

The opening shot is a LS showing the two main characters, Marie I and Marie II, sitting, wearing bathing costumes, against a wall of wooden planks. The shot is in black and white. After a more or less nonsensical dialogue in which the Maries state that they are bored and that they are going to embark on a destructive rampage in order to overcome that boredom, one of the Maries pushes the other out the frame. The cut that follows (similar to Deren's shot transitions in A Study in Choreography

for Camera) completely undermines what the spectator would expect if the conventional style of editing were being employed. It could could be argued that Chytilová is exploring in practice Mukařosvký's notion of 'illusory pictorial space'. The next shot is a LS showing the Marie who has been pushed falling into the water. The shot is in colour. This change from black and white to colour already breaks the continuity of the scene. Nevertheless there is a causal connection between the two shots (push - fall). But the water is not seen in the first shot. Nor is any wooden plank seen in the second. This second shot just shows water and a girl falling into it. Furthermore there is nothing visual and nothing in the dialogue to indicate that what appears in the second shot is the off-screen space of the first, or vice versa. In other words, these two spaces are not contiguous by logic but they are forced onto the spectator by juxtaposing them by continuous shots. The second shot does not correspond, then, with the expectations of the spectator. The spectator does not know where the Maries are; the first shot which appeared to be an ES was not an ES. After the shot of the water, the scene continues with the girls playing in a field of green grass. No connection is made with the first shot, nor with the second. The transition from the wooden planks to the water to the green fields is so sudden that the spectator is surprised, even confused. The spectator does not know where the scene, if it is a scene at all, is taking place spatially. Nor does the spectator need to know. The spectator will later (halfway into the film) get to know that the wooden planks form part of a bathing complex by the River Vltava, and even when this complex is not shown fully in an ES, the relation between the water of one shot and the wooden planks of the other will be made clear. Film space is here irrelevant as a narrative vehicle. The narrative is so loose that it does not need a vehicle. The spectator is being deliberately disorientated. The two Maries have decided not to believe in anything and so Chytilová provides an appropriate vehicle for their refusal to accept reality. As a director she does not believe in a conventional film language, and like the two Maries, she will embark on a destructive journey. The ES is, so to speak, the first casualty. There are several scenes throughout the film in which , with no ES shown, the reflexive shot of a character is shown in black and white, when the character himself/herself has been shown in colour in the previous shot, and vice versa. There is a scene at a bar, shot in sepia, where the spatial unity is achieved through the gazes of the Maries looking off-screen, the corresponding reflexive shots, and the soundtrack. And again when the Maries are peeping through a hole in a billboard, shot in black

and white, the corresponding reflexive shot, in colour, shows green fields. On another occasion a scene is shot with no ES to 'prove' a philosophical point: the Maries are asking each other whether they exist, whether, in a Berkeleyan tour de force, they are perceived by other people or not. They whistle and shout at a gardener who is tending his garden. He does not notice them and continues with his work. The scene is shot using a shot-reverse-shot technique, with no ES.

But what makes Sedmikrasky fascinating is that during the film there is an ES, a full shot, of the Maries, which is 'cut' into pieces by the Maries themselves. And these pieces are cut again and again turning the ES into some sort of moving collage. The Maries are bored in their room; both pick up scissors. First they cut the food they had been eating into small pieces, but when the food has run out, they start cutting pictures of food they find in some magazines. When these pictures again run out they decide to cut each other into pieces. Marie I and Marie II start cutting each others limbs but they end up cutting the film space of the ES into tiny pieces. The ES becomes a series of hundreds of moving details within the ES itself. The ES is here questioned in its essence: it has no orientation or narrative role. The ES has ceased to exist. We witness the death of the ES. Cinema becomes a pure visual graphic art, and thereby Chytilová joins the film avant-gardes of the 1920s and 1930s, in France, Germany, the Soviet Union, and in Czechoslovakia itself. In Ovoce stromů rajských jime, Chytilová's last film of the 1960s, there is still an abundance of reflexive shots without the use of ESs.

The main characteristic of Chytilová's use of the 'non-ES' technique is its self-awareness, to the point where, in Sedmikrásky the reaction against the ES is made part of the narrative itself. She not only makes no attempt to 'hide' her questioning of the classical style, but she wants the spectator to be aware of it and even be involved. By playing with the spectator's expectations she is directing the spectator to question the ES (or at any rate the conventions of film space) just like she does.

Miloš Forman's use of the 'non-ES' technique is much simpler and non-reflexive, invisible (in the same sense as when in conventional editing, the cutting is said to be 'invisible'). Forman does not want the spectator to notice the editing, the cut. When Forman leaves out the ES from a scene or sequence, it is mainly to convey, or support visually, the main theme of his 1960s films, that of the confrontation between young people and authority, be it parents or state propaganda. The absence of

the ES also isolates individual characters. Scenes with no ES are found in all his 1960s films, except for Hoří, má panenko, where although most of his editing style is still present, all scenes do have their corresponding ES. This is perhaps because Carlo Ponti was the co-producer of the film; that is, commercial conventions had priority over any artistic 'whim'. Interestingly enough, in Menzel's films of the 1960s, scenes with no ES appear before and after Rozmarné leto, which was also co-produced by Carlo Ponti.

Konkurs, consists of two medium length features, Kdyby ty musiky nebyly and Konkurs. The former tells the story of two young men, Vláďa (played by Vladimir Pucholt) and Vašek (played by Václav Blumental), each of whom plays in a wind orchestra. Both young men share a passion for motorcycling. Both orchestras are preparing themselves for the regional competition in honour of a local 'buditel' (revivalist). Unfortunately for the two young men, that very same day the (regional, international) motorcycling grand-prix is taking place. Neither of them attends the music competition and, instead, both go to the motorcycling event. Next day each of them is fired from his orchestra only to be accepted by the other's. The basic editing principle, then, used by Forman in this film, is that of cross-cutting. The film is roughly divided into three scenes (not counting the introduction): the rehearsing, the competition, and the sacking (with the subsequent welcoming at the other orchestra). During the rehearsals Forman cross-cuts between the orchestras; during the competitions he cross-cuts between the music festival and the motor race; during the sacking he cross cuts again between the two orchestras. It is during the rehearsals that no ESs are used. The scene starts as follows:

1. LS of part of a wind orchestra. All musicians are looking off-screen left. There is a huge photograph (probably of the Revivalist) on the background wall. PAN right showing the conductor, Jan Vostrčil, almost in a PA. At one point, he looks down off-screen left, and reprimands a musician for taking a nap.
2. CU of a musician. He is looking up off-screen right.
3. Cont. of 1.
4. CU of Vláďa looking off-screen left.
5. Cont. of 1.
6. CU of trumpet playing a solo.

7. Cont. of 1.

8. MS of Vláďa (gaze off-screen left) and part of the orchestra (not that seen in shot 1. Part of the shoulder of the photograph seen in shot 1 can be discerned but barely - it is only after several viewings that one discerns what that 'dark stain' on the background wall is).

9. CU of Vláďa. Gaze is off-screen left.

10. Cont. of 1.

11. PA of second conductor (Frantisek Zeman) - fire brigade orchestra.

12. CU of Vašek, gaze off-screen left.

13. CU of horn player.

14. Cont. of 11.

15. MS of the orchestra's (managing) director. The background is similar to that of shot 11 (same wall, same patterns on the wall).

16. Cont. of 11.

17. Cont. of 1.

18. CU of music instrument and hand unwrapping some medicine. TILT up to show how the musician swallows the medicine.

19. Cont of 1.

20. MCU of Vostrčil.

21. CU of musician, gaze off-screen right (voice of Vostrčil).

22. Cont. of 1.

23. Cont. of 11.

24. CU of musician (voice of Zeman).

25. MS of Zeman.

26. MS of Vostrcil.

27. LS of part of orchestra, Zeman, and the musician seen in 15, now seen from the back. Vašek is not seen in this shot, therefore it could be interpreted as a point-of view shot of Vašek, or perhaps, more likely, of the double-bass player in shot 30, due to the angle of the shot (too high to be from someone sitting in the orchestra).

28. MS of musician playing the bass tuba.

29. CU similar to 13 showing the horn players.

30. MS of double bass player.

31. MS of two players from the percussion section. Their gaze is off-screen left. In the background the same wall as in 15 can be seen.

32. CU of flute player, his gaze off-screen right.
33. CU of trumpet player. Gaze is off-screen left.
34. CU of clarinet player. Gaze off-screen right.
35. CU of second clarinet player. Gaze off-screen right.
36. CU of tuba player. Gaze off-screen left.
37. CU of double bass player.
38. MS similar to 28.
39. CU of Vašek, gaze off-screen left.
40. Cont of 25.
41. Cont of 26.
42. CU of front row player (the brass section can be seen in the background). One of Vostrčil's hands is in the frame.
43. MS of two bass-tuba players, gaze off-screen left. Vostrčil's voice.
44. CU of trumpet player. Vostrčil's voice.
45. Cont of 1.
46. CU of tuba player, gaze off-screen left.
47. Cont of 1. Vostrčil starts talking about fulfilling one's duty. (Dramatic anticipation in the cut, that is, Vlada will not fulfil his duty towards the orchestra.
48. CU of Vláďa, gaze off-screen left.
49. Cont of 1.
50. CU of Vláďa, gaze off-screen left.
51. Cont. of 1.
52. MS of managing director of the fire brigade orchestra (behind him the conductor). Again he is talking about duty.
53. CU of Vašek, gaze off-screen left.
54. Cont. of 52.
55. Cont. of 1.
56. Cont. of 52.
57. Cont. of 1.
58. CU of clarinet player. Vostrčil's voice.
59. MCU of Vostrčil.
60. CU of tuba player.
61. Cont. of 59.
62. Cont. 52.

63. CU of Vostrčil (+ jump cut).
64. CU of clarinet, oblique towards the bottom left of the frame.
65. Cu of clarinet player, gaze off-screen right, clarinet oblique to the right.
66. CU of clarinet player, gaze off-screen left, clarinet oblique to the left.
67. CU of the tuba player.
68. CU of trombone player.
69. Cont. of 1.
70. MS of Vostrčil.
71. Cont. of 52.
72. CU of Vostrčil.

I shall not discuss here how the spectator understands the cross-cutting since he/she is familiar with this technique since the times of Griffith's films, even though here it is done without ES; the differentiation of the orchestras is achieved mainly through the different music played by each orchestra, and by the conductors' voices. I shall only discuss how each youngster is 'edited' into the scene: shots 1-10, 17-22, 26, 41-51, 55, 57-61, 63-70, 72 belong to the Vláďa/Vostrčil orchestra; shots 11-16, 23-25, 27-40, 52-54, 56, 62, and 71 belong to the Vašek/Zeman orchestra.

Shot 1 is only a partial ES of the orchestra. Most important, it is a partial ES where Vláďa does not appear. Later, in shot 8, Vláďa is shown with part of the orchestra. Again this is a partial ES - but it does not establish Vláďa's position with the conductor of the orchestra, Vostrčil. Except for this shot, Vláďa is always shot in CU (shots 4, 9, 48, and 50) and all these shots where Vláďa appears are followed and preceded by shots of Vostrčil (3 and 5 for 4; 7 and 10 for 8 and 9; 47 and 49 for 48; 49 and 51 for 50). The Vostrčil shots, then, are reflexive shots on Vláďa and the spectator perceives from Vlada's gaze direction (left) that Vláďa is sitting to the left of the conductor. But on a metaphorical level Vláďa is 'juxtaposed' to Vostrčil (who is the figure of authority) and at the same time isolated from him, the isolation being emphasized by the size of the frame of the Vláďa shots; that is, close ups. Furthermore this sense of confrontation between the young man and the figure of authority is confirmed when the conductor is talking about fulfilling one's duty, that is, about the importance of each musician being present on the day of the competition. The Vostrčil shots are followed by those of Vláďa (shots 47-50). It

seems, then, that the words are particularly directed to Vláďa. The sequence makes for dramatic anticipation, since later the spectator will see that Vláďa does not appear the music competition and instead goes to the motorcycle racing.

The same technique is used with the other orchestra. Shot 27 is a partial ES of the orchestra where Vašek is not shown. Similarly, Vašek is only shown in close-up, again, always looking off-screen left (shots 12, 39, and 53). The Vašek shots are either followed or preceded by the figure of authority: shots 11 and 40 of the conductor, and shot 52 of the managing director. In this last case it seems again that the words of the managing director about duty and so on are directed to Vašek, who like Vláďa, will 'desert' the orchestra for the grand-prix race. It is the same case of confrontation as in the first orchestra. Perhaps here the isolation is greater, since Vašek is never shown together with the musicians.

When Vláďa is dismissed from 'his' orchestra the scene takes place without an ES (not so with Vašek who is dismissed in a full shot with Zeman). Interestingly enough both youngsters are welcomed in the other orchestra in full shot (perhaps because the relationship has just started and has had no time to deteriorate).

In Černý Petr this technique of isolating the young by not using the ES is further employed. The film has two scenes with no ES. One of them takes place in a café where Petr, the main character, and his friend of the same age, are chatting about jobs, girls and so on. The table where they are sitting is isolated from the rest of the café. The spatial unity is achieved by a reflexive shot of Petr's friend onto the café (actually onto a woman singing), by the music and the other noises of the café. There is a false ES of the café in this scene where neither Petr and his friend nor the musicians responsible for the music appear.

In the second part of Konkurs which gives the title to the whole film ESs are used; these are, however, not clear cut, but rather confusing, in particular those which take place in the corridors of the Semafor Theatre, packed with girls waiting for their turn to sing at the auditions. The collective, then, is not shown clearly. But from that unclear 'mass' some characters are clearly isolated, thus individualising them. This is the case of Věra (Křesadlová) and the hairdresser apprentice, on both of whom the story of Konkurs is centred: Vera has talent, but does not dare sing in the audition - which she would have probably won, since the film tells the spectator that she is the only semi-professional singer to attend the auditions; the hairdresser has no talent but still tries.

In Lásky jedné plavovlásky the theme of confrontation between young people and state authority, in this case state moral propaganda, is again shown with no ES. The film tells of the problems encountered by a girl at an apprentices' boarding school who has a tendency to fall in love easily. She romanticizes love naively in order to feel special. Each time she falls in love, she believes that the man with whom she falls in love will remove her from the boarding school, out of a monotonous life in a factory where she is just one more girl. The town where the apprentices' boarding school and the factory are situated has a serious 'social' problem: there are not enough men around. The head of the local Communist Party Committee arranges a plan of 'social engineering' with the senior officer of the local army garrison which is near by. Both men arrange a ball where the young girls of the factories would meet the young soldiers of the garrison. But instead of the young soldiers, on the day of the ball the army sends the not so young reservists. The ball is not very successful, but the main character meets and spends the night with the orchestra's pianist, who, when they are both naked in bed, promises her eternal love. She believes him, breaks with her boyfriend, packs her things and sets off to Prague in order to start living with the pianist, who by then has forgotten all about her. The girl arrives at his parents' house to discover that they know nothing of her. When the pianist comes home at dawn he more or less tells her that she cannot move in, for the time being. After overhearing a discussion between the pianist and his parents, the girl realizes that for the pianist she has only been a one night stand. She returns to the boarding school.

The scene in particular where Forman confronts young people with state authority with no ES constitutes, as we shall see, a parody of the pseudo-democracy, the hypocrisy of the public collective voting typical of the times. Its starts as follows:

1. CU of a female tutor warning the girls (of the apprentices' boarding school) to defend their honour and virtue. Her gaze pans from off-screen left to off-screen right.
2. CU of first girl. Behind her other girls are seen. Her gaze off-screen left.
3. CU of second girl, her gaze off-screen left.
4. CU of third girl, her gaze off-screen left.
5. CU of fourth girl, her gaze off-screen left.
6. CU of fifth girl, her gaze off-screen left.
7. CU of sixth girl, her gaze off-screen left.

8. CU of seventh girl, her gaze off-screen left.
9. CU of the blonde (the main character), her gaze off-screen left.
10. Cont. of 1. The tutor proposes that the motion (that should defend one's honour) should be voted on by the class. PAN right shows in MCU two 'volunteers' who are officially conducting the voting.
11. LS of the whole classroom (all the girls seen in shots 2-9 are seen here, but nobody from shot 1). All the girls vote in favour of the motion.
12. Cont. of 10. The volunteers seem satisfied with the outcome of the voting.

In this scene, the person who is isolated from the rest is the figure representing authority, the tutor and her 'assistants'. Those who do not take the authority seriously are those who form the collective; they are united in their confrontation with official propaganda. Shot 1 is the POV shot of shots 2-9 and vice-versa, shots 2-9 are the POV shots of shot 1. This isolation of the figure of authority emphasizes the hypocrisy and risibility of the whole situation. The educator is completely out of touch with the girls and the girls feel completely detached from her, they do not care what she is saying. They vote just out of inertia and in order not to get into trouble, without for a single moment having any confidence in the theatre of it all. Most of them, as in the case of the main character, have already surrendered their virtue and honour. Official morals and aesthetics are out of touch with reality, particularly that of young people.

In the second scene of the film with no ES, that in which the second ball of the film takes place, the pianist (the other main character) is isolated, individualized, from the mass of dancers - the musicians and the dance floor where hundreds of people are dancing are never shown together. Furthermore only the musicians' legs are shown in CU, and then, after a PAN and TILT the pianist is shown in MS. Again here, on the one hand, the pianist is isolated and on the other what is not relevant for the narrative is not shown.

It was not until Žert that Jireš fully employed and developed this 'non-ES' technique. He had edited with no ES in his previous works, that is, in his first feature film Křik and in his contribution to Perličky na dně, Romance.[44] In each occasion only one scene is edited with no ES. On both cases the director is attempting to convey the

[44] Unfortunately I have not been able to watch his student shorts, Sál ztracených kroků (1958) and Stopy (1960).

isolation of the main characters. Křik concerns a young couple who are awaiting their first child. The action takes place during the hours previous to her giving birth. While she waits in the hospital, he (a television repair man) goes his rounds visiting the places where his services are needed. Most of the film is centred on him, and on his thoughts about having a child: how they met, the responsibilities acquired, and his doubts about whether one can think about bringing children to the world in a time when a third world war could destroy the whole planet.

In Křik the non-ES scene takes place at the beginning of the film, inside the taxi on the couple's way to the hospital where Ivana will give birth. The outside of the taxi is never shown. Nor is there an ES of the taxi's interior showing both the young couple in the backseat and the driver at the wheel. The driver is shown, only in a reflexive shot of the couple. Likewise, all the other shots of the sequence not showing the couple are the couple's reflexive shots: the streets, the arrival of the taxi at the hospital and so on. Thus the absence of the ES helps the director isolate the characters from their surroundings within a space of their own - as if they were trapped (or protected) by a sphere. This feeling of oppression and aggression coming from the outside world, a claustrophobic effect, is emphasized by the use of the subjective shots which, in most cases, show the outside world behind components (the closed windows, the windscreen) of the taxi, which because the rain outside prevent, more that allow, to see what is outside. This same purpose of isolation is given to the absence of ES in one scene of Romance (a lyrical story about a young apprentice falling in love with a Gypsy girl outside a cinema). The action takes place in a tram crammed full of passengers. Again the exterior of the tram is never shown (the spectator, as in the case of the taxi, has to provide that) and the interior is shown with medium close-ups and close-ups. The main characters of the short film, the young couple, are thus isolated (she is a Gypsy, a further cause for isolation in 1960s Czechoslovakia), first from the outside world and secondly from the rest of the tram passengers. In this case the director not only wants to individualize the characters but also wants to convey the natural isolation that a couple in love imposes on themselves. The isolation in this case is not complete, since the couple is greeted by the young man's foreman who happens to be in the tram (he is drunk, another way of isolating oneself from society). The shots where the couple are not shown are not subjective shots of the couple, since the couple are not looking off-screen but at each other. They are isolating themselves from the rest.

These themes of the isolation of the individual from society, and the individualization of the character within the film space, the main characteristics of the editing techniques of the Czechoslovak New Wave, are also present in Žert, where isolation is also conveyed by to the absence of the ES. But Jireš (unlike Chytilová and Forman, and most of the New Wave directors who employ this absence in spatial terms, that is, in conveying the narrative's topography) gives this technique a temporal property. He employs the technique to bridge the different temporal tenses of the narrative - that is, the narrative taking place in the present with the flashbacks, the narrative taking place in the 'reality' with that discoursing in the character's memory. This interest in exploring the parameters of cinematographic time by means of editing (most probably influenced by Alain Resnais' L'Année dèrnier a Marienbad, produced in 1961) is already present in Křik. But in Křik it is not explored by means of leaving the ES out of the sequence but by means of a 'hinge' shot - which has already been used by Chytilová in Strop. Chytilová uses a close-up of Marta preceded by a point of view shot and followed by a false point of view shot (which is in fact the POV shot of Marta's next close-up in the following scene) to hinge both scenes. Even though Chytilová was more interested in the spatial contiguity of the scenes, the temporal implication is there: in the succession of scenes. Jireš, in Křik, does not use one close-up as a 'hinge', but two. Juxtaposed to each other these two close-ups appear to be a shot-reverse-shot sequence. In the first close-up, for example, the husband has his gaze off-screen right, while, in the subsequent close-up, the wife has her gaze looking off-screen left. Even though each character is in a different time, the husband in the present, and the wife in the past, in his memory, this match of gazes creates a temporal continuity (and a spatial contiguity in a similar way to the cross-temporal eye-match found in L'Année dèrnier a Marienbad). In reality it is not a shot reverse shot sequence, since the first close-up of the 'sequence' is in fact the last shot of a scene, while the second shot of the 'sequence' is the first of the next scene. The perception that there is no break in the linearity of the time flow between the two close-ups is created due to the spectator's familiarity with the shot-reverse-shot technique. Once again the spectator's expectations are being tampered with. This impression is achieved precisely because there is no ES to which both close-ups can be referred spatially - each belongs in fact to different ESs in their respective scenes - and thus each close-up is free to interact spatially with the other through the gaze match. Both

scenes, then, are juxtaposed giving the impression that they are continuous but at the same time through the cut, they are kept separated, thus preserving the logic of the narrative. For a moment, between the two scenes, the characters are isolated from their 'natural' surroundings, from their corresponding ESs. During this moment the characters are isolated in time (Jireš even sometimes freezes the image of each of the close-ups) and space.

Jireš develops this 'hinge' shot-reverse-shot sequence in Žert, whereby each narrative time, each sequence, succeeds the other; both narrative times co-exist in parallel editing within one scene of real (and not filmic) time. Žert is based in the novel of the same title written by Kundera ,who co-scripted the screen-play. In the early 1950s, Ludvík Jahn, the main character, as an undergraduate, sends a postcard with a joke about Trotsky to a fellow student, Markéta, whom he loves. The postcard is 'intercepted' by the Communist Youth Committee at the university and Jahn is accused of Trotskyism. Jahn is betrayed by his own friend, Zemánek, who had promised him he would solve the situation. Instead, Zemánek, personally directs the public dishonouring of Jahn. In collective vote Jahn is expelled from the Party and the university. He is then drafted into military service in the 'black regiment' to undergo re-education. After that, he spends several years working in the mines. Around twenty years later, working now as a scientist, by chance he meets, Zemánek's wife and decides to avenge himself by seducing her. But the plan backfires since Zemánek and his wife are in the process of getting divorced.

One example of Jires's non-ES technique is the narrative introduction by Ludvík Jahn of the event of May 1949 leading to his expulsion from university. The scene is preceded by a close-up of Ludvík, his gaze off-screen down and left and starts as follows:

1. ELS high angle shot (doc. footage) of a demonstration. It is 1 May 1949.
2. ELS high angle shot (doc. footage) of a demonstration.
3. CMS of Pavel Zemánek dancing. His gaze is straight into the camera. PAN to violinist (Jaroslav), who is also looking straight into the camera.
4. CMS of Markéta dancing, her gaze straight into the camera.
5. PA of Pavel dancing (gaze straight to camera).
6. LS (doc. footage) of a demonstration. Ludvík's narration begins.

7. LS (doc. footage) of a demonstration.

8. LS (doc. footage) of a demonstration.

9. LS (doc. footage) of girls dancing.

10. LS (doc. footage) of nurses. Ludvík's narration ends here.

11. PA of Ludvík with his back to the camera. He turns round and looks off-screen left.

12. MCU of Markéta among the people in the demonstration, her gaze into the camera (slightly to the right). She addresses Ludvík. Ludvík answers off screen.

13. Cont of 11. Their conversation continues in voice-over. Ludvík as shown in the shot does not speak.

14. MS of Markéta. Gaze into camera. Ludvík's narration, talking about Markéta, restarts.

15. MS of Markéta.

16. MS of Markéta.

17. LS of Markéta dancing. Ludvík's narration stops.

18. LS of Ludíik crossing the frame from left to right. He stops and looks off-screen right. Voice of Markéta reciting a poem.

19. PA of Markéta reciting a poem. Sometimes her gaze looks towards the camera. Ludvík's narration in off: 'Markéta took poetry very seriously.....'

20. CU of Ludvík (voice over from Markéta). Ludvík looks at camera.

21. MS of Markéta looking straight at camera. Conversation with Ludvík.

22. LS of Ludvík by stairs (he does not speak in image). Continuation of their conversation.

23. Cont. of 21.

24. MCU of Ludvík by door visible in shot 22. Gaze is straight into camera. Voice of Markéta crying.

25. MS of Markéta crying by tree. She turns round and looks at camera.

26. PA of Ludvík by door at shot 22.

27. MS of Markéta leaving for summer camp. She waves into the camera (her voice over reads a letter sent from the summer camp).

28. CU of postcard sent by Ludvík to Markéta. He reads the joke written by him.

29. LS of Ludvík going to his hotel room. He opens the door.

30. MS of a door opening revealing a student sitting at a table. PAN to the left shows two more students. The third to be shown, his gaze off-screen left, tells (Ludvík) to sit

down.

31. PA of Ludvík, gaze off-screen right, closing the door behind him (from the inside of the room). The students from the previous shot start to interrogate him in voice over.

32. CU of second student looking straight to the camera, he answers for Ludvík. PAN left to third student.

33. LS of the three students as a jury. On the wall behind them there is a socialist emblem.

34. MS of Ludvík with his back to the wall looks off-screen right.

35. CMS of first student. PAN left to the second and then to third (each asking a question in turn and passing the postcard to each other.

36. CU of postcard being passed from hand to hand.

37. CMS of first student.

38. LS of Ludvík sitting on his bed. Gaze off-screen right.

39. CMS of third student looking off-screen left. PAN right to second student.

40. Cont. of 37.

41. MS of Ludvík washing his socks at the hotel room's wash-basing. He turns round and looks off-screen right.

42. PA of girl opening door. She looks off-screen left, and then right.

43. CMS of third student. He stands up. PAN right to the second student, looking straight into the camera.

44. PA of Ludvík by radiator with his back to the camera. His socks are now on the radiator.

45. MS of the third student and the girl from 42. She tells him something at the same time as she is looking off-screen left. He also looks off-screen left.

46. MS of first student. Gaze off-screen left.

47. CU of first student. Gaze straight into the camera.

48. CU of first student. Gaze to the camera, slightly to the left.

49. CU of third student. Gaze off-screen left.

50. CU of first student looking straight into the camera.

51. LS of Ludvík by radiator brushing his shoes. Looking straight into the camera.

52. MS of second student looking straight into the camera.

53. CU of third student.

54. Cont. of 52. PAN to third student as he picks up Ludvík's briefcase. Here Ludvík's

narration starts again - telling who those students are.

55. LS of Ludvík lying on bed. Looking off-screen right.

56. PA of Pavel (Ludvík's voice over is asking him for help). TRACK to a MS of Pavel walking. He is looking straight into the camera, slightly off-screen left. PAN right to Kostka. He is looking straight into the camera.

57. CU of Pavel. He is looking into the camera and telling Ludvík not to worry.

58. PA of Markéta (voice over of Ludvík asking her why she showed them the postcard). She is looking into the camera. TRACK to CU of Markéta where she says that the Party has to know everything. (From this shot till shot 67 a well-known Russian dance is heard.)

59. Cont of 55. Voice from previous shot.

60. LS of Markéta continuing to say what she started in 58: 'I am not leaving you'. This said in CU after a TRACK.

61. LS of Markéta. She walks forwards to a MS and repeats that she will never leave him.

62. LS of Markéta on a boat. Ludvík's narration: 'I remained completely alone'.

63. LS of corridor full of students. All looking straight into the camera and avoiding it as it TRACKS forwards.

64. LS (possible jump cut) cont of 63.

65. MS high angle shot of Ludvík, looking at the camera sitting in bed. He then looks off-screen right.

66. PA of third student in the corridor. Gaze off-screen left. He avoids camera by looking outside the window.

67. MS of Ludvík by hotel room window. He is looking off-screen left and up, and then left and down.

68. LS of door step. High angle shot of some window.

This scene has been introduced by the previous one, first, thematically by means of the conversation between Ludvík and Kostka (who had been expelled from university, shortly after Ludvík, for his Christian faith) in which they discuss their expulsion from university (the scene above narrates why Ludvík has been expelled) and technically by means of a close-up of Ludvík looking off-screen down and left. It gives the momentary impression that the first shot of the scene is a subjective shot of

Ludvík. But if the logic tells the spectator that shot 1 of the above scene is not what Ludvík is looking at (Kostka's flat is not big enough to hold an entire demonstration on Wenceslas Square) the use of Ludvik's off-screen gaze tells the spectator that Ludvík is remembering it - this is emphasised by the fact that several of the banners make references to the May Day parade of 1949. Shots 3-5 have Pavel Zemánek, Markéta, and Jaroslav looking straight into the camera. Even though it is not a correct gaze match under conventional editing rules the shots still refer the spectator back to Ludvík's off-screen left gaze at the end of the previous scene, albeit by now slightly. This off-screen left gaze is repeated (shot 11) after a brief voice over narration from Ludvík while a sequence of documentary footage appears (shots 6-10). Again Ludvík's gaze has a retroactive effect - the documentary footage has been 'remembered' by Ludvík. But in this case it is matched, almost correctly, by Markéta's gaze in the next shot (shot 12). It becomes now a shot-reverse-shot sequence (shots 11-13) with no ES. Each shot becomes the subjective shot of the other. Each character remains fixed within his/her narrative time. Furthermore, the conversation of the shot-reverse-shot is kept strictly in the past: although Ludvík's voice is heard, the spectator never sees him open his mouth. This shot-reverse-shot sequence ends with a shot of Ludvík, his gaze off-screen left, and it is followed by a sequence of shots of Markéta looking straight into the camera (shots 14-17). Again the gaze match is incorrect but it still gives an impression of spatial unity, an impression that Markéta and Ludvík are looking at each other. Ludvík's narration continues during shots 14-17. Shot 17 is followed by another shot of Ludvík, this time looking off-screen right. Again retroactively shot 18 turns 14-17 into its subjective shots, in particular 17 since it is the closest. Likewise shot 18 is the subjective of 17. But shot 18 is also the first shot in the next shot-reverse-shot sequence (18-26). Shot 26 also subordinates 27 as its subjective shot and even perhaps shot 28. Shot 26 is in turn the subjective shot of 27. The next shot-reverse-shot sequence (shot 29-55) is introduced by the match-on-action of the door opening. They are different doors: that seen in shot 29 belongs to Ludvík's hotel room; that seen in 30 belongs to the university's Communist Youth Committee room (twenty years earlier). The spectator knows this since in previous scenes he/she has become familiar with Ludvík's hotel room which he/she has seen in several long shots. The spectator might be surprised momentarily to see these young people in 'Ludvík's room' but soon understands that they are different rooms, that he/she is watching a 'flashback'. And nevertheless the gaze 'matches' and the ensuing

interrogation tell the spectator that there is spatial unity. This spatial unity is retained in the next sequence. Shot 55 which is acting as the end of the sequence 29-55 also subordinates shots 56 and 57 as subjective shots, and vice-versa. Ludvík's voice reinforces this perception. Shot 55 is repeated again as shot 59, thus becoming the subjective shot of Markéta in shot 58 and in turn making shot 58 its subjective. The same relation applies between shot 59 and shots 60-62.The last sequence (63-67) is a shot-reverse-shot between the students in the corridor and Ludvík in his hotel room. Shot 68 ends the scene by taking back the narrative to the present time. It is a subjective shot from Ludvík's gaze in the previous shot. Shot 67 ends with Ludvík looking down off-screen left outside of the window. Shot 68 is a high angle shot of the building 'outside' Ludvík's window. This technique of conveying a flashback is repeated on several occasions throughout the film.

Conventionally a flashback scene would start first with a MCU or a CU of the character who is remembering the scene. That convention is followed here. But traditionally, the flashback would be introduced with a blurring or unfocusing of the CU of the character, dissolving then into the scene of the flashback. This would be repeated when the film comes out of the 'past'. A dissolve was used precisely to avoid using a cut, so that the spectator, it was argued, would not mistake the shot following the CU of the character remembering with a subjective shot. Jireš, on the other hand, is consciously playing with the spectator's familiarity with conventional editing techniques, that is, with his/her expectations, in order to involve him/her in the editing process of the scene, to support the themes of the film and ultimately to question, to explore, film time.

In this scene Jireš is merging two conventional editing techniques, that of the shot-reverse-shot sequence and that of parallel editing, within the flashback scene (which is a narrative technique). The shot-reverse-shot is, mainly, a spatial technique, while parallel editing is a mainly temporal technique. The shot-reverse-shot sequence is used to convey a narrative (mainly a conversation) which is taking place in a specific place at a specific time. Meanwhile parallel editing is used to cross-cut between scenes which are taking place in different places at different times.In other words, the shot-reverse-shot sequence is concerned with conveying the spatial unity of the scene in order subsequently to convey the narrative, while parallel editing is concerned with showing two different actions, two different scenes simultaneously, or rather, alternatively. Alternation is the same basic principle governing the shot-

reverse-shot sequence. The shot-reverse-shot sequence alternates the narrative (time) within one place; parallel editing alternates two different narrative lines.

What enables Jireš to achieve this 'merger' is the absence of the ES. With this absence, all spatial references are removed and thus the shot-reverse-shot sequence becomes temporal, or in other words, an alternation of the narrative in time, like parallel editing (and vice versa, due to the absence of the ES, the gaze 'matching' turns parallel editing into a sort of shot-reverse-shot). This does not occur within one time, or one narrative line, since this is already done by means of cross-cutting (whereby a narrative line starting in two different places is directed towards and eventually concluded in one single place) yet between different narrative times, in this case the present and the past. None the less the shot-reverse-shot maintains its spatial character since each shot is showing different spaces, but in this case different narrative spaces. Jireš has managed to enclose several narrative times within one false spatial unity. This false spatial unity gives the spectator the impression that he/she is watching a continuous linear narrative. It turns the principle of the ES upside down. An ES is not only not needed for the spatial orientation of the spectator; it is also not needed for the temporal orientation of the spectator, since the spectator understands that the scene is a flashback. Technically the scene consists of one narrative line, logically, however, it is two, past and present, memory and reality. Jireš seems to be exploring the concept of time in narrative, and in particular, in cinematic narrative. On one level he is keeping past and present in the narrative apart by means of parallel editing and on the other level he is merging both film 'tenses' by means of the shot-reverse-shot sequence. The narrative times are opposed, confronted and at the same time there is only one time. So the question is whether the scene is occurring in several narrative times or in one.

As discussed, by among others, Béla Balázs, and as seen and explored by Resnais in L'année dèrnier a Marienbad, everything that occurs on the film screen, occurs in the present tense, that is, in the present tense of the spectator. Every image is perceived as unfolding before the eyes of the spectator. Indeed it could be, then, argued, that what Jireš is trying to convey is that the whole scene (and most of the other flashbacks in the film) is unfolding in the present, within Ludvík. Ludvík is walking through the town, walking into his room, washing his socks and so on and at the same time remembering his expulsion from university and so on all in the present tense. This is the principle behind the cinematographic flashback, conventional or not.

But here Jireš's technique emphasises the vividness and the presence of Ludvík's memory: that not only has he not been able to forget but also that he has not forgiven. It emphasizes the fact that Ludvík is still living his past again and again, and that he has not changed. The spectator does not know what he looked like when he was expelled, nor what his voice sounded like at that time. (Even when Ludvík is seen during the flashback scenes that take place in the military camp, there is no attempt by the director to make the actor appear younger.) It is as if Ludvík had not grown older, as if time had not passed. But of course he has, since the spectator is watching a middle aged man, but it seems to him that it is still the day on which he sent the postcard, or the same day that he was interrogated, or the same very day that he was expelled. Ludvík is a character living in the present but trapped in his past. Trapped thus, he is lonely and isolated. Just as he was isolated at the time of his expulsion, so he is isolated in the present. Once again the absence of the ES enables the director to convey the interiorization of the main character and his confrontation with the socialist regime, with the collective spirit of official propaganda. The interiorization of the character is further achieved by the use of Ludvík's intermittent first-person narration, which in turn poses further questions on the nature of narrative time. It becomes a three 'voice' montage: the flashback; the character remembering; and the (same) character narrating. The character narrating is clearly separated from the character remembering since at no point does the latter speak during the scene. But the spectator recognises the voice from other scenes where he does speak. Where to situate, temporarily, the character narrating - whether in the same narrative time as the character remembering or not - is a question which although fascinating falls out of the scope of this thesis. But the inclusion of this narrator makes the interiorisation and perhaps even the detachment of the figure of Ludvík even more poignant. One imagines a lonely figure in need of an interlocutor.

In his next feature film, Valérie a tyden divů, Jireš continues to explore the borders between reality and imagination using a Surrealist text by Vítězslav Nezval. The main technique used by Jireš is that of subjective shots (from Valerie's point of view) with no accompanying ESs. What Valerie sees is quite often not shown together with Valerie herself thus the doubt created of whether what Valerie sees is 'real' or merely a product of her imagination.

Pavel Juraček's employment of the 'non-ES' technique occurs in his first

feature film Každý mladý muž . The film is divided into two medium length stories Achilovy paty (Achilles' heels) and Každý mladý muž. In Achilovy paty the basic technique to convey these 'non-ES' scenes is the shot-reverse-shot sequence or simply the reflexive use of off-screen space. There are three such scenes and on more than one occasion a simple point-of-view shot is used to show what the main character is watching. The story is quite simple. A soldier has to go to the hospital situated at an unspecified distance from the barracks. He is accompanied by a sergeant. Once the soldier has visited the doctor both return to the barracks. During the trip they try to pick up several women - who are played by the same actress (all women are in reality one to the eyes of the male beholder). Both soldiers are shown most of the time, in the trains, in the streets, and so on, alone, and with the exception of the women (and the waiters who serve them in the bars) there is not much interaction with other people. On two of the few occasions in which they do have some contact with the people around them these scenes are shown with no ESs. And it is surely no coincidence that the people shown in the 'other' shots are old people. The first such scene occurs in what appears to be an empty restaurant. Both soldiers are shown in a full shot together with the waiter who asks them whether they are going to eat. When told that they are only going to have a beer (actually the young soldier never asks for beer and the sergeant always drinks both), the waiter takes away the tablecloth and exits the frame. In the background empty tables are to be seen. At that moment the young soldier looks to his left. The next shot is a LS showing several empty tables. In the background at the farthest table an old man is reading the newspaper. This shot is followed by a shot-reverse-shot sequence of the two soldiers having a conversation.

The second scene with no ES takes place in a park (which is empty). The soldiers are sitting, resting on a bench. They have taken their boots and socks off. They look a bit scruffy, as a whole 'unsoldierly'. They are confronted by an old man who recriminates them for taking off their boots in a public place. He shouts at them that their appearance is disgraceful , that altogether the appearance of young men is disgraceful these days. The scene is conveyed in a shot-reverse-shot sequence with the gazes of the old man and the soldiers matching (the soldiers, always shown together in one shot, look off-screen right, and the old man off-screen left). The words of the old man can be heard in both series of shots.

Similarly a shot-reverse-shot sequence conveys the third 'non-ES' scene in which an old lady from a window above laughs at the soldiers (who are shown alone

in empty streets). Here not only the gazes match (soldiers off-screen left up, old lady off-screen right down) but also the corresponding camera angles (the shots of the soldiers are high angle, those of the old lady, low angle). The old lady's laugh is heard in all the shots.

In each of the scenes the soldiers are shown alone (empty bar, empty park, empty streets). In one scene an old man ignores them, or rather, does not notice them; in the next an old man shouts at them, and in the last they are laughed at by an old lady . The director's intention seems to be to convey a metaphorical confrontation between generations: youth is either ignored or reprimanded (misunderstood) or laughed at by contemporary society. Furthermore showing the soldiers for most of the time alone conveys their isolation from society (trapped within their uniforms, which they themselves are not keen to wear).

In the next medium length story, Každý mladý muž, there are two scenes with no ES. One of them occurs in one of the barracks' dormitories during the night after a long day of manoeuvres. Most of the soldiers are sleeping, exhausted; they have not even taken their uniforms off. Two of them, though, have remained awake, talking, among other things, about the fourth dimension, time. In most cases the New Wave directors achieve the perception of spatial unity by means of a reflexive use of off-screen space but here the spatial unity of the scene is achieved without the use of subjective shots. The scene starts as follows:

1. MCU of three soldiers sleeping (dim light coming from the right; Hanzlík's voice over talking about the forthcoming ball and theatre; the ticking of a clock is to be heard).
2. CU of three rifles supported by a rack (same dim light and continuing soundtrack as in 1).
3. CU of a football under a bench (same lighting and soundtrack as in 1).
4. CU of a clock (time 11.03) (same lighting and soundtrack as in 1).
5. PA of Hanzlík (on the right of the image) and the other soldier (on the left of the image) sitting at a table. A lamp is seen over their heads illuminating the table and the surroundings. The sound of the clock can still be heard (as it will be throughout the scene).
6. MS of soldiers sleeping (same lighting as in 1).Voice over and talking from Hanzlík

and the soldier. Now they talk about how rockets move through space. The shot starts in the middle of a sentence.

7. MS of rifles and the rack (Hanzlík's voice over, similar lighting as in 2).

8. MCU of two benches, underneath one of them there is a football. On top of the other bench a cup and a jug of water. (Hanzlík's and soldier's voices over, similar lighting as in 3).

9. MS of clock (Hanzlík's voice over). Time: 11.52.

10. MCU of Hanzlík and soldier (same position as in 5). They talk about the fourth dimension.

11. LS of soldiers sleeping (the rack of rifles can be seen on the left, similar lighting as in 1).

12. LS of rifles, radiator and helmets (similar lighting as in 2).

13. LS of the two benches seen in 8, similar lighting to 3. Hanzlík's voice, asking the other soldier how many children he would like to have.

14. LS of clock and lamp seen in 5. Time: 12.45.

15. CU of Hanzlík, gaze off-screen left. He says that to give birth is something disgusting.

16. CU of the other soldier. Gaze off-screen right.

17. Cont. of 15.

18. Cont. of 16.

19. Cont. of 15. From a off-screen left gaze Hanzlík turns his head to off-screen right. He looks up and down.

In this scene the spatial unity is created by the voice of Hanzlík heard in the shots of the sleeping soldiers and the objects lying around them, and by the noise of the clock which is heard in all the shots. The creation of the spatial unity is subtlety reinforced by the use of the lighting. The lighting of each shot corresponds to the apparent distance of the elements in that shot from the light seen in shot 5. The lighting in the shots of the soldiers sleeping and the objects surrounding them comes from the right and is dim. The lamp has been seen in shot 5 where the two soldiers are talking. Therefore the spectator is led to perceive that the sleeping soldiers are to the left of the space where the two soldiers are having a conversation. The last shot of the scene, although it could technically be regarded as a gaze at the sleeping soldiers, is not necessarily that. Between this shot and its previous supposedly retroactive

subjective shot (shot 13) there are too many shots to create the impression of subjectivity. It is the aural elements and the use of the lighting that create the spatial unity and not shot 19. The part of the room where the soldiers are sleeping is gradually united by the repetition of several objects from other shots - the rifles seen in 2 are then seen in 11 together with the soldiers and so on. Thus the room is divided into two halves, with one element, perhaps the most important narrative element in this scene, the clock, placed in between. The sequence which governs the structure of the scene starts with a triad of shots showing the soldiers and the objects (shots 1-3), followed by a shot of the clock (shot 4), followed by a shot of Hanzlík and his interlocutor (shot 5). This is then followed by the next triad (6-8), the clock (9), and the interlocutors (10). For the third time the pattern is repeated, soldiers and objects (11-13), clock (14), and the interlocutors (15 onwards as a shot-reverse-shot sequence). The frame for the triad is enlarged every time the triad is shown (from CU in the first triad to LS in the last) - the clock shots follow the same pattern - the frame where Hanzlik and his interlocutor are shown becomes smaller (from LS to CU in the shot-reverse-shot sequence). In addition there are two ellipses in the scene. One takes place between shots 5 and 6, the other between shots 10 and 11. Each ellipsis is 'announced' by the introduction of a new topic of conversation in the middle of a sentence (like in shot 6 for example) or by the abrupt 'disappearance' of a conversation (from shot 10 to 11). The ellipses are then confirmed by the shots of the clock, each time showing a different time (shots 4, 9 and 14). One the conversations is about Time. Hanzlík tells his interlocutor how a rocket in space would travel for thousands of years and end up in the same place as it set off from. With this scene, Juraček seems to be attempting to convey the same interplay between space and time as the rocket experiences in space. The flow of narrative (the clock) assists in the creation of film space. The actual flow of the real time, that is, the scene itself, affects the space seen in the screen, that is, affects the perceptual distance of the spectator to the object seen. That is, the spectator starts watching the sleeping soldiers in close-up, he/she is made to perceive as being close to them. On the other hand, the spectator starts watching the soldiers who are talking on LS, that is from afar. These frames are gradually reversed; that is, the spectator perceives a movement from the bunks where the soldiers are sleeping to the table where the two other soldiers are talking. This perception of movement has been achieved by removing all irrelevant space from the editing scene but also by removing all irrelevant time from the narrative. This is symbolized by the clock which lies in the

middle of the two spaces, that is, has a space of its own, a dimension of its own, the fourth dimension. A playful editing 'philosophical' scene which at the same time isolates two soldiers, who, for the period concerned, no longer form part of the platoon, of the collective, but are two mere individuals having a banal and common conversation. These two soldiers are not depicted as talking about heroism nor about their duty to defend the homeland, the nation, from invaders, what one would expect from official propaganda, they are simply talking about life, the universe.

In the above scene Juraček tries to draw the spectator into the narrative space. Ivan Passer, however, goes possibly even further in involving the spectator in narrative space in Intimní osvětleni. Here the attempt to make the spectator feel that he/she is inside the narrative space together with the characters is not carried out in one scene but systematically throughout the film.The spectator is asked to create the film space together with the director.[45] Intimní osvětleni is a film technically based almost entirely on the absence of the ES. This applies particularly to the interior scenes within the house where most of the action takes place. Within the house all but two scenes take place in the dining/living room. This room is where the family members spend most of their time. The room is therefore the geographical/political centre of the house. It is the narrative centre of the film. This room is never shown as one whole space: no ES of the room is ever shown. It makes for a convincing demonstration of Mukarovský's argument that film 'space gains definition with the progression of the sequence of pictures'.[46] In this case the space does not gain definition within one sequence or scene but within the span of four scenes of the film. The room is divided into parts by Passer, but not all parts are shown within one scene. It is the task of the spectator to join, to associate, to synthesize these parts, thus reconstructing the room, recreating the narrative space. The spectator has to create the film space.

The first scene situated in this central room is when Bambas , the headmaster of the local music school, is having tea with his friend Petr, a cello player in a symphony orchestra, who has been invited to play the solo in Sunday's performance of Dvořák's Cello Concerto, and the latter's girlfriend, Štěpa. They have just arrived from the city (this is basically the plot of the film, not much else takes place except that on Saturday evening Bambas and Petr get drunk and attempt to run away - from

[45] For a detailed analysis of the editing techniques employed in this film see my MA dissertation, Editing techniques in Intimní osvětlení, SSEES, 2000.
[46] Mukařovský, 'On the Aesthetics of Film'.

their current lives - to pursue a career as wandering musicians playing at weddings and funerals. They wake up back at Bambas's house with a tremendous hangover). Without joining them for tea, Bambas's wife and their son are also present in the scene. It starts as follows:

1. MS of Bambas' wife with her child. She is sitting on a sofa. She is looking off-screen left. She invites them too eat the babovka (sponge cake).
2. MS of Bambas, Petr and Štěpa at the table having tea. Their gaze is off-screen right.
3. MCU of Bambas's wife and child. Gaze off-screen left.
4. MCU of Petr eating his babovka.
5. CU of Bambas, gaze off-screen right.
6. CU of Petr, gaze off-screen left.
7. Cont. of 5. (voice over of Bambas' wife).
8. Cont. of 1. Gaze off-screen left. The child is not seen in this shot.
9. Cont. of 5.
10. Cont. of 4.
11. CU of Štěpa, her gaze slightly off-screen right, almost towards camera.
12. CU of child, his gaze slightly off-screen left, almost towards camera.
13. Cont. of 4.
14. Cont. of 1.
15. MS of Bambas and Petr.
16. Cont. of 1.
17. Cont. of 5.
18. Cont. of 12.
19. Cont. of 11.
20. PA of grandmother, gaze off-screen right.
21. Cont. of 5.
22. Cont. of 4.
23. Cont. of 12.
24. Cont. of 11.
25. Cont. of 5.
26. Cont. of 4.
27. Cont. of 5.
28. Cont. of 1.

The spatial unity of the scene is once again achieved through the gaze match, the voice over of the characters, the logic of the conversation, the repetition of elements, such as the table, the similarity in each shot of the lighting and so on. Perhaps more important in this editing sequence are the visual elements that differ from shot to shot, what Kučera refers as 'neshoda' (discord). The main discord elements in the shots are the backgrounds. It is through the backgrounds that the spectator gets the four cardinal points of the room. The mother is sitting on a sofa which is placed against a wall. In shot 2 (which establishes Bambas, Petr and Štěpa together but not the other two characters in the scene) behind Bambas the spectator sees another wall with a door to the left which is open. It leads out of the house. Behind Petr and Štěpa there is a third wall with a large window. Through the gazes of the characters in these first two shots the spectator perceives that the wall behind Bambas is opposite to the wall behind his wife, with the wall with the window behind Petr and Štěpa joining the other two walls. In shot 8 the child is no longer seen with his mother. He 'reappears' in shot 12. In the background the spectator sees the fourth wall with an open double- winged glazed door, through which part of a hall can be seen. The repetition of the table and the gaze matching (between the child and Štěpa) establishes the boy as being in front of Štěpa, therefore the wall and the door behind the boy are opposite the large window behind Štěpa and Petr. Moreover, in the last shot, the boy returns to his mother. He enters the frame from the right. The spectator can then assume that the wall seen behind the boy in shot 12 was to the left of the mother. This wall is therefore the fourth wall of the room. The sofa, the table, the big window, the door behind Bambas, the double-winged glazed door (and part of the hall) will be spatial references for the spectator throughout the remaining scenes that take place in this room, whose centre has not yet been shown. All shots (except 12) give the impression of having been shot from the centre of the room.

There is only one shot in this scene which is not matched in any way, that of the grandmother. The gaze is not matched and the lighting is significantly different - it is too dark to be in the same room as the rest of the shots in the scene. The background of the shot does not correspond to any of the four walls of the dining/living room. The shot is evidently outside the room.. The spectator will have to

wait to learn where this other space is.

More details of the room are seen during the long dinner scene which is divided into two parts: the dinner itself and the arrival of the pharmacist. The the dinner party is logically centred on the table, the same table where tea had been served in the previous scene. The spatial unity is once again achieved by the same techniques of gaze matching, voice over, lighting, the repetition of elements (for example the chicken leg which 'flies' from one shot to another) and so on. Petr and Štěpa sit at the table in exactly the same places as before, with the same window behind them, which refers the spectator back to the previous scene. It is the same room. The grandfather is now sitting where Bambas was sitting before. The door behind is now shut. Behind Bambas, who is sitting opposite the grandfather (this is established through the gaze match) and to the left of Štěpa (seen together), a lamp and a radio set can be seen. If Bambas is sitting opposite the grandfather, the lamp and the radio set must be against the same wall as the sofa in the previous scene. Through the movements (exit and entrance of frame) of Štěpa and Bambas's wife, the spectator perceives that the small table where the children are having dinner is placed against the same fourth wall of the previous scene. A small section of the table was in fact visible in the first scene behind the boy but it is only now when it is seen in full. More details are also seen in this scene regarding the dining room's relation to the rest of the house. The double-winged glaze door are now seen behind the shots of the wife (who is sitting at the table opposite Petr and to the right of the grandfather). One of the doors is open and the hall can be seen now better. Behind the grandmother (sitting opposite Štěpa, to the left of Bambas, and to the right of Bambas's wife) the hall can also be seen. A radiator is to be seen in the hall. The topography of this hall, in particular the radiator, corresponds to where the grandmother was seen in the first scene. Later, from this hall, part of the living room will be seen. After the chicken leg crisis, and after the women have gone to the kitchen, Bambas's wife returns to the dinning room through the double-winged glazed doors. During one of the door's swings the three men are briefly seen eating at the table. The hall and the dining room are thus established. But the dinning room is still not shown in full. At the end of the scene a medium shot of Petr (foreground left of the screen), the grandfather (foreground right), Bambas (centre) and the pharmacist (sitting on the sofa at the background where Bambas's wife was sitting in the previous scene) establishes the four men together and the position of the table in relation to the sofa. But no more is established.

The next scene to take place in this room starts with a full shot of the four men playing a Mozart string quartet. It establishes the four men together (from left to right): the pharmacist playing the first violin, the grandfather the second violin, Petr, the cello, and Bambas the viola. In the background the large window is to be seen. Not much else is shown within the frame. But the window gives away that they are playing in the same room as the other scenes. At one point there is a cut to a shot of the grandmother opening the double-winged glazed door. Through the eye match she is perceived to be precisely opposite the quartet. That is, it is the same door, the same window, the same room. The table seems to have been moved away to make room for the quartet.

In the last scene to take place in this room the two characters involved (Bambas and Petr) are shown together on several occasions, but the room continues to be shot partially. The spectator sees an armchair (where Bambas is sitting, listening to a record) the record player/radio and part of the sofa. In another shot the spectator sees the table and the window together, and so on. It seems that the director is deliberately refusing to give away the topography of the room in full. The spectator is constantly forced to refer back to other scenes to understand where the characters are situated. Even in the last scene of the film this room is spatially related to the rest of the house, even when the scene is not taking place in it. The scene takes place on the verandah. It is one of the few scenes in the film which has a conventional ES. In the background of some of the shots showing the grandmother, the spectator sees through the door (behind the grandmother, leading into the house) a lamp, and part of a record player/radio. In another of these 'grandmother' shots, through the door leading into the house part of an armchair, and a large window can be seen. This door, then, is that same door seen behind Bambas in the first scene.

The dining room scenes are not the only scenes shot with no ES. Others are shot using the shot-reverse-shot sequence with no ES. The film seems to have been carefully planned topographically. Passer was deliberately refrained from showing the whole space. By removing all space irrelevant to the narrative, Passer was not merely isolating the characters, individualizing them, but was also involving the spectator in the creative process of the film. This involvement takes the spectator right to the centre of the narrative space. It seems that all space irrelevant to the narrative is allotted to the spectator. It is the space for the spectator to observe from, to watch the narrative; therefore it is a space that cannot be seen. The spectator is in the centre of

the room. The spectator has his share of narrative space and thus he/she is isolated in the space allotted to him/her. The spectator becomes an individual, one more individual in relation to the rest of the characters, close to the characters but separated from them by the frames of the shots. Passer's employment of the 'non-ES' technique thus removes not only the characters but also the spectator from the collective. The spectator's experience of watching the film is not a collective experience but an individual experience.

There is yet another reading of the non-ES technique in this film. For most of the time the characters are shown separately, individualized, particularized and nevertheless the impression given is that they are close to each other. Not only 'physically' but also on a symbolic level. This is the case in the two scenes in which Štěpa is confronted spatially to old women with no ES. In the first scene, we have a dialogue between Štěpa and the grandmother, that takes place in the guest room, while the grandmother is making the bed, the spatial unity is achieved through gaze matches (Štěpa is always looking off-screen left, the grandmother off-screen right), the voices of the conversation which normally enter the shots of the person who is listening, the noise of the bed as both women try its firmness (trying perhaps its suitability for love making) the bed itself which although not shown fully, parts of it appear in each shot, and the lighting which varies its intensity depending on the distance each character (shot) is from the window and balcony through which the light is coming in. Both women are symbolically confronted. It seems that Passer is symbolizing two stages of a woman's sexuality. On the one side of the bed (that is, the thalamus) there is a woman who is at the end of her life, telling the story of how she eloped with her husband when she was still a teenager. She tells this story while making the bed on which later in the film Štěpa and Petr will make love (in ellipsis). And she is telling this to Štěpa on the other side of the bed, Štěpa as a woman who is at the beginning of her sexual life. One woman remembers her sexuality; the other is discovering it. The distance between the two, the distance of the path that separates both women is paradoxically shortened by the absence of the ES; that is, the non-inclusion of the ES once again removes all irrelevant space, bringing the characters closer to each other at a symbolical level and at the same time retaining their separation, their individuality within a symbolic space. The same generational confrontation withthe same sexual motives and perhaps even including references to fertility rites is found in one of the sequences of the scene that takes place in a pub after the funeral at which Bambas and

the grandfather had been playing the funeral music. The spectator 'finds' Štěpa and Petr in the car while Bambas and the grandfather are still tippling in the pub. After a while, Petr leaves the car to look for them. During this time a group of old peasant women return from the fields and pass by the car where Štěpa is sitting alone. The sequence juxtaposes close-ups of Štěpa looking up out of the car window off-screen right with medium close-ups of the elderly women as they pass by looking down and off-screen left (that is, at Štěpa) in a shot-reverse-shot pattern. This is done with no ES and with no dialogue. Apart from the gaze matches it is the music coming from the pub, heard throughout the scene, and above all the shadows of the elderly women seen on Štěpa's face (that is, the movement of the elderly women is matched with that of the shadows: the elderly women move from right to left of the screen and the shadows in the opposite direction) that unify the space. This is the same symbolic space as used in the previous scene with the grandmother. Štěpa's youth is juxtaposed to the death which the elderly women are already approaching. The elderly women are coming from a long journey; that of their lives and their sexuality: they are walking from the fields which they have been tending (from the lighting it seems to be summer), fertilising. Once again the irrelevant space is removed, bringing the two 'sides' of the journey close to each other.

Ostře sledované vlaky, directed by Jiří Menzel, is based in the Hrabal novel of the same title. Set during the German occupation of Bohemia and Moravia in Second World War it recounts the story of the rite of passage from youth to manhood of Miloš Hrma, a young railway worker (his surname means mons veneris). Hrma is during the film (novel) initiated into the mysteries of sexuality and partisan fighting. He is shot dead after throwing a bomb at a German munitions train. Like Intimní osvětleni, Ostře sledované vlaky, has its narrative geographically centred on a room that is never shown in full. I interviewed Menzel in January 2003.He said that the reason for this was that the room was too small to put the camera at a sufficient distance which would allow him to take a (full) ES of the room. Perhaps this was the case, but from the partial ESs seen in the film one has the impression that the room is big enough, and in any case the camera could have been placed on one of the doors' thresholds to show it in full, or a PAN could have been used. Whatever the reason for Menzel' not using the ES, its absence conveys something to the spectator. It has a narrative and thematic use and it demands the active involvement of the spectator.

First of all, the technique is the same as in Passer's Intimní osvětleni: each

scene that takes place inside the room provides the spectator with details of the room (or in some cases with partial ESs) which the spectator will associate and thus gradually be able to recreate the room, to create the space where the narrative is occurring. That is, Menzel uses this technique in the same way as Passer does, in order to involve the spectator in the creative process of the film. In this case, however, it is not the spectator who is 'placed' at the centre of the room, but the film's main character, Miloš Hrma. Most of the shots of the room, the main room of the railway station, are in fact POV shots of Miloš Hrma. In other words, the whole room, is the off-screen space of the shots where Hrma is seen. There are scenes which take place in the room without Hrma's presence, but these are few. And in those scenes where Hrma is present, he is sometimes shown with other characters, or even in partial ESs of the room, but every time a shot is shown which is the off-screen space of the partial ES it is Hrma's subjective shot: the spectator sees the room mainly through Hrma's eyes. The spectator watches the narrative through Hrma's point of view, in fact, through Hrma's narration. Indeed the film starts with Hrma's voice-over first person narration, in which he introduces himself, his family and his story. The voice-over narration occurs only in the first scene before the credit titles. One might say, then, that this voice-over first person narration is taken up by the absence of the ES, and by Hrma's subjective shots. Indeed the first time the spectator sees the room is mainly through Hrma's subjective shots. Hrma has just arrived at the station for his first day at work. The scene starts as follows:

1. CU of a telephone on a wall and of the lower part of a clock whose weights are to be seen.
2. CU of a machine that warns of the imminent arrival of the trains to the station. The noise of the telegraph machine can be heard (it will be heard throughout the scene).
3. CU of telegraph machine together with its paper reels.
4. MS of Hrma (his left side lit up). Gaze off-screen right then left.
5. LS of part of the room. Both machines seen in shots 2 and 3 can be seen. Sitting by the telegraph machine is a young woman. There is a small window in the back wall.
6. MS of old man putting coal inside a stove.
7. CU of woman in 5.
8. Cont of 4.
9. LS of Hrma (in the right foreground with his back to the camera) sitting at his desk.

In the left background is Hubička. Behind him on the far wall are the clock and the telephone seen in shot 1.

10. Cont of 4. Hrma is now looking off-screen right.

11. Cont of 2. A bell falls warning of the arrival of a train.

The next scene takes place outside on the platform with the train arriving.

The sequence of shots above is governed by the shots where Hrma is shown alone (shots 4, 8, and 10). Shot 4 subjectively governs shots 1, 2, and 3 retroactively and shots 5, 6, and 7, which are POV shots of shot 8. In the same way shot 10 governs 11. Shot 9 establishes shots 1, 4, 8, and 10 spatially but leaves out the rest. That is, shots 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 11 are established spatially by Hrma's shots (by means of Hrma's gaze, which is not matched by any other gaze) and by the noise of the machines. Shots 2, 3, 7, and 11 are established in shot 5. Shot 6 (the old man and the stove) stands alone - the only element that establishes it as belonging to the rest of the room is Hrma's gaze. The unity of the room, then, is centred on Hrma's gaze. This sequence contains most of the topographical elements of the room and they will serve as spatial references for the spectator when they reappear through subsequent scenes taking place in the station's main room. Other elements will be introduced and will subsequently reappear in further scenes. They will be revealed gradually together with the elements known to the spectator. Thus the spectator will gradually associate all the elements together and recreate the whole in his mind. For example, in the next scene inside the room the machine warning of the trains' arrivals, seen above in shots 2 and 5, will be seen next to where Hrma is sitting at his desk. This time the camera angle is not from behind the table (as in 9 above), but from one of the sides of the table. The machine stands beside the table. This machine will be seen so often that the spectator will have the impression that it is in the middle of the room. Half way into the film a PAN will show a partial establishing of half of the room and this machine will, indeed, be seen in the middle of the room. Each element in the above scene (and others which appear in later scenes) undergo the same process. Twelve scenes take place in the station's main room and in all but two Hrma is present. The other two are when Hubička seduces the young telegraphist (seen in 5 and 7 above) and he 'improperly' uses the station's rubber stamps to mark her thighs and bottom, and when, in the final scene, the railway commission come to judge Hubička for improper use of the rubber stamps. In this last scene Hrma appears at the beginning before leaving to throw the

bomb at the mmunitions train. In several of the Hrma scenes in the main room the technique used is that of the shot-reverse-shot sequence with no ES.

In Ostře sledované vlaky, Menzel is not only employing the 'non-ES' technique to isolate and individualize characters but specifically to isolate and individualize one character, one point of view, that of a young man discovering life, his sexuality, and his responsabilities. Menzel isolates the narrator. Incidentally, Bohumil Hrabal's novel of the same title, on which the film is based (Hrabal himself co-scripted the screenplay with Menzel) is composed as an Ich narration.

Menzel had already developed the non-ES technique in his contribution to Perličky na dně, Smrt pana Baltazara, although here he employs it in only one scene. This is the scene when the married couple, who share a passion for motorcycles and cars, arrive at a grand-prix circuit. They are watching the motorcyclists prepare their machines in the pits. The scene starts as follows:

1. LS of the car in which the couple have been travelling (together with the woman's father) next to a fence. Behind the fence all the activity of the boxes is to be seen. The soundtrack carries the noises coming from the boxes. These noises are heard throughout the scene.
2. LS of the old man next to the fence. His gaze is off-screen right to the boxes which can be seen out of focus in the background.
3. LS of motorcycles behind the fence (same type of fence as in the previous two shots).
4. LS of two motorcycles and one small truck. Two men are working on one of the bikes.
5. MS of the inside of a van, containing a motorcycle.
6. CMS of a motorcycle (its lower part) and part of a man working on it.
7. CU of the motor of the motorcycle shown in the previous shot.
8. MS of a motorcycle (a Bultaco).
9. MS of two Hondas (the wife's voice over names the bike).
10. MS of a motorcycle (the wife names it).
11. MS of a Norton (the wife names it).
12. LS of husband and wife behind a fence (same type as in 1). Both are looking off-screen left.
13.MS of legs (man's and woman's) and a motorcycle (husband's voice over).

14. LS of two men at work over a motorcycle. (husband's voice over).
15. LS of men working on a motorcycle. (Husband's voice over).
16. LS of two men working on a motorcycle. (husband's voice over).
17. MS of a rider testing a motorcycle testing it. (husband's voice over).
18. PA of rider putting on his leather suit. (husband's voice over).
19. LS of husband and wife behind fence both looking off-screen left.
20. LS of corner of the fence. On the outside the old man. (wife's voice over).

Shot 1 would normally be the ES of the scene, but here neither the married couple nor the old man are to be seen. Their presence is, however, symbolized by the car in which they have been travelling. The characters are spatially joined to the rest of the scene mainly through the soundtrack and the direction of the gazes (which are not matched). It could be argued that there are two points of view in this scene, that of the married couple and that of the old man. The old man would have as POV shots 3-8, and the couple would take over in shot 9, when their voice over starts. At the same time, all shots could be the POV shots of the old man or of the couple or of both. The technique, as used by Menzel here, does not define only one subjective centre. Perhaps what centres the scene on the couple, rather than on the old man, is the soundtrack in which the couple can be heard. Throughout the short film it is they who do the talking except for the last sentence which is spoken by the old man. Also the couple in this scene give the impression of being much passionate about their watching than the old man, who seems to be more or less indifferent to what is going on. Likewise, although the rest of the scenes are shot with ESs, the impression given is that they are mostly shot with POV shots from the couple, since they are constantly watching the race and talking - their voice is heard over the shots of the race. It could be argued then, that Smrt pana Baltazara is narrated by the couple both visually and by means of their dialogue. The technique employed in Ostře sledované vlaky has been developed but not fully employed here since the ES is used and the centralization of the narrative is not fully defined in one character but in two or three.

The 'non-ES' technique is once again used by Menzel in Skřivánci na niti, this time more than to convey an Ich narration, to de-collectivize, that is, to individualize a group of people who have been forced to by the socialist authorities to become a collective of workers. The film tells the story of several middle-class individuals (a judge, a university professor, and so on) who find themselves in a forced labour camp

so that they can be re-educated after the 1948 Communist take over. Those who complain or even ask a simple question ('why?') disappear to work in the mines. Menzel uses a mixture of subjective and non-subjective non-ES scenes. Perhaps the most significant is the scene taking place in the barracks where they sleep on weekdays (some of them are allowed to spend weekends at home). The interior of the room where the characters are assembled is not shown in full. The 'collective' is divided into three shots: the university professor and the judge are seen together having a conversation by the window; the saxophone player plays his instrument lying on his bunk; and the main character, Pavel Hvězdar, is seen cleaning the floor. The Socialist state has failed twice in this film: instead of turning these bourgeois into a conscientious collective of workers they have been turned into a group of friends, each retaining his individuality; secondly the Socialist state has failed to prevent the director from individualizing these people, and from showing them in ESs only to mock Socialist Realism aesthetics: a newsreel crew arrives at the steel works to take some shots of the collective of workers denouncing the war in Korea. The crew leave without successfully recording the needed shot since the workers instead of shouting what they have been told to, they start questioning the sentence which each had to shout. Skřivánci na niti was premiered in 1990.

The most subjective use of the abscence of the ES is that found in the opening scene(s) of the first story in Mučedníci lasky, Pokušení manipulanta (The temptation [s] of the operative). Here Jan Němec employs the technique to enter the character's imagination, interior reality. The character's isolation from society is then turned into an extreme extroversion. There is no causal narrative in this short story but a surreal concatenation of thoughts, desires, and memories of the main character. The spectator is never really sure whether the narrative is showing 'real' events taking place outside the character or whether everything is taking place in his mind. One is not even sure whether the opening scene is one single scene or a series of concatenated scenes. The fact is that there is no ES for the first eighty nine shots of the film. It is not until shot 90 that the main character is shown together with other characters. Until then the spatial and narrative unity of the scene(s) is achieved mainly through the character's gaze and subsequent POV shots. The film shows the loneliness and routine life of a young clerk and how he tries to escape them, by searching for the sensuous and for love. Possibly, however, the film only shows how he imagines the freedom he longs

for.

The opening sequence of the film is an example of the classical method of situating the story physically , topographically. It is classical in its essence, but not in editing techniques. The clerk is first seen in at his office. The traditional way to 'reach' him would be to show first a panoramic extreme long shot of the city where the office is (supposed to be) situated. This shot would show how busy, how claustrophobic, stressful and so on, the city is. Gradually closer frames would detail the neighbourhood, then the street, the building (which the spectator would then understand to be where the character is working). After showing the exterior of the building a shot would show the interior, and one or two shots later the character. Instead, Němec has a long shot, a plan-americaine, and a close-up (both low angle) in succession, of a traffic policeman inside his booth, looking down straight into the camera. In the first two shots his left hand is signalling stop. In the close-up he gives the 'go' signal. This shot is then followed by a high angle LS of an empty cobbled street. A man then enters the frame , crosses it and exits. Due to the opposite angle (to the policeman shots) it seems that this fourth shot is the policeman's subjective shot. By association the subsequent shots (5-11), also showing LS of people hurrying through the streets are also POV shots of the policeman. Shot 12, the first shot of the next sequence, shows the clerk at his desk. There are no long shots of the city, no transition shots to the office, not even a shot of the building where the clerk is sitting; nevertheless, the stress of the big city has been conveyed. This scene/sequence could be regarded as the classical introductory sequence, but it could also be, at the same time, a subjective recollection on the part of the clerk of his (daily) journey to work, or even a nightmare, since the spectator sees the clerk for the first time with his head resting over his arms on the desk. Every shot (1-11) could be the subjective shot of the clerk. There is no eye match nor off screen gaze to unify this subjectivity but since his head is resting on his arms, one might speculate that the 'gaze' is interiorized (memory or dream). In other words, there is no ES in the opening scene because the geographical centre of the sequence is the clerk himself. This ambiguity continues in the next sequence of shots (12-19) where each shot of the clerk is alternated with shots of women walking or running through the streets or of women's legs going up or down stairs. Is this a sequence of parallel editing or of cross-cutting, or of the clerk's POV shots or again the clerk remembering or desiring the women he has seen this morning on his way to work? Each shot showing the clerk has a would-be Bach

musical theme in the soundtrack, and each shot showing the women, in the streets or in the stairs, contains their 'natural' sounds (traffic noises, high heels on the stairs, and so on). The next sequence (shots 20-28) starts with the clerk leaving the front of a building (where most probably his office is situated). In the following shot in MS a woman is sitting, smoking, at a table in a night club. The soundtrack carries a saxophone solo playing some jazz-like music. Then follows a shot of the clerk on the street. The difference between the two shots is too great to unify them spatially and temporally: in other words, the woman must be in another place at another time. But where and when is the question that the spectator asks. Again the spectator has the impression that the shot showing the woman is the clerk's recollection or a fantasy. At the end of the shot where the clerk is seen, he directs his gaze off-screen right, and this is followed by seven shots of scenes in the street: people entering houses, looking down from their windows, closing shops and so on. In this case it is clear that these shots are the clerk's POV shots of how the city is ending its working day. The next sequence (29-52) alternates shots of the clerk, by the window in his room, looking off-screen left up and down, with shots of the streets, of windows (in the buildings opposite), each shot having a different angle to 'follow' the concordance of the clerk looking up and down. Every time the clerk looks inside his room (that is, off-screen right), the 'reverse' shot is that of women in night clubs. The soundtrack of these night club shots has the same saxophone theme in the soundtrack. Again the spectator asks whether this is this memory or fantasy. It is clear that the shots of the women in the night club are not what the clerk is seeing since the spectator has seen the clerk's room and he/she knows that he is alone in his room. So whenever the clerk looks into his room he is 'looking' inside his mind. Or perhaps it is a sequence of cross cutting, since the clerk will eventually end up visiting those night clubs. The last shot of the sequence (shot 52) shows the clerk taking some money out of his bureau drawer and preparing to go out. It is followed by two shots inside a cinema. The first is a medium close-up of the clerk sitting in the stalls. The lighting on the clerk's face is that of the reflection of film screen, the sounds are those of a movie. At the end of the shot, the clerk looks round over his left shoulder. The subsequent shot is that of a couple in the cinema (same lighting, same soundtrack) kissing each other. Over the movie's soundtrack the saxophone theme can be heard. This is the clerk's POV shot. Then follow three sequences of nightclubs. In each case the sequence is preceded by a shot of the clerk walking through the dark empty streets, that is, a transition shot indicating

that the clerk is moving from one place to the other, from the cinema to the first night club and so on. Each time the night club sequence is shot with no ES and in shot-reverse-shot technique: the clerk alternated with what he sees. The gazes match. Likewise the lighting matches from shot to shot. The same sound track can be heard in all shots. In one of these night clubs the women , or rather the shot where the women were seen in the previous sequence, are repeated (with the same saxophone theme). The question that arises is whether the clerk has been in this nightclub before or whether it is the materialization of the clerk's fantasy. The scene ends when the third night club closes and the clerk is shown in a medium ES with other nightlife characters, among them a beautiful woman (who is incidentally played by Němec's girlfriend at the time, Marta Kubisová). The clerk invites them all home, and they accept. In other words, the ES is shown in this long introductory scene only at the precise moment when the clerk starts socialising, when he interacts with other characters, when he talks to them, when he touches them. In other words, the ES is shown only when what is 'seen' is 'really' happening, when the clerk has come out of his interior-monologue life. From this moment onwards the film is always edited with the ES.

In the next episode of the film, Nastěnčiny sny (Natasha's dreams), there is no ES of the castle where most of the action takes place and there is one scene in which a singer sings from a balcony to the courtyard where the audience is sitting. The singer and the audience are not shown together in an ES. The whole episode is, as the title indicates, a dream. In other words, Němec here is again using the absence of the ES to reinforce the subjectivity (in this case Natasha's) of the action.

Evald Schorm employs this 'non-ES' technique in only one of his films, Pět holek na krku. None the less as will be seen later, he did use the ES in a particular way, close to the 'non-ES' technique, in another of his films, Návrat ztraceného syna). Pět holek na krku tells of the vicissitudes of a girl in finding friends, since her father is an influential member of the local Communist Party. He is the chairman of the housing committee. Her companions at school envy her and even hate her for it, because of the privileges her father's position gives him. Schorm portrays the character of the girl, Natasha, as a victim both of her schoolmates' torment and her own abuse of her father's political power in order to avenge herself. Schorm portrays her as an isolated and at same time closely observed (that is an object of envy) figure

in the opening scene at the theatre - essentially the technique used is similar to that used in Chytilová's Strop. The opening scene has no ES. Natasha is shown alone in the box reserved for the local Communist bosses, mostly in LS and these shots are either preceded or followed by shots of her school mates (all girls) who are in the upper balcony: the angles of the shots match (those of Natasha are high angle, those of the girls, low angle). The girls' gazes are off-screen left. It is only when Natasha leaves the box to join her school mates that she is shown in ES together with them. But the theatre is still not shown in ES. A boy whom all five girls fancy is never shown in the same shot as the girls. He is still only an object of desire. The girls have still not dared to talk to him. In this case, not only the angles are matched (girls: low angle; boy high angle, that is, the boy is lower down in the theatre than the girls), but also the gazes (girls: off-screen right; boy: off-screen left). The scene takes place during the overture to the opera and ends when the curtain rises. Throughout the film there are flashes to the performance. In most cases these flashes are preceded by close-ups or medium close-ups of Natasha looking off-screen. The flashes, then, appear to be subjective shots of Natasha, emphasizing her isolation on the one hand and the workings of her mind on the other. It seems that Natasha is remembering moments of the opera (Carl Maria von Weber's Freischutz). At the end of the film the girls go to the theatre once again to see the same opera and again no ES of the theatre interior is shown.

I have so far argued that the absence of the ES in these New Wave films had three purposes: to portray the isolation and individualization of a character or characters; to convey somehow a subjective narration, that is, an Ich narration; and to involve the spectator in the creative process (thus individualizing the spectator). All three purposes form part of the same phenomenon reaction against Socialist Realist aesthetics and against the collectivization of society by the official communist propaganda. This is best seen and understood when one analyses what the ES represented to the New Wave directors. Two films, Bočan's Nikdo se nebude smát and Schorm's Návrat ztraceného syna, best convey the significance the ES had in New Wave films. How it is employed perhaps helps explain why its absence was so recurrent in New Wave films.

The opening scene in Nikdo se nebude smát starts as follows:

1. ELS (extremely high angle – bird's eye view) of an empty square. People gradually enter and walk about the square tracing a path on the snow. (The credit titles are shown during this shot.)
2. MS of an old car. Underneath the car the legs of a man who is repairing something. The legs and torso of woman cross the frame from left to right.
3. PA of a pub window. The barman is inside. The postman (outside) walks from left to right. He greets the barman and turning round he looks off-screen left and says 'Good morning'.
4. LS of an old couple behind a closed ground floor window. They nod their heads.
5. Cont. of 3. Barman (inside) watches how a young boy pushing a sledge with a snowman on it; the boy crosses from left to right. The boy turns round and looking off-screen left says 'Good morning'.
6. Cont. of 4.. The old couple, nodding their heads, return the greeting.
7. Cont. of 3. Woman seen in shot 2 (recognized by the fabric of her coat) crosses the frame from left to right. She stops and looks up and off-screen left.
8. MS of the old couple behind the window. They nod their heads.
9. CU of woman in 7. She returns the greeting looking off-screen left. The sign on the pub's window can be seen on the background.
10. MCU of her legs (seen in 2). She hesitates, wondering whether to walk through the snow or continue along the path. She finally decides to continue along the path.
11. MS of the young woman's back. She exits the frame right. TILT reframing to the boy's sledge. The boy comes out of the pub with a jug of beer and places it next to the snowman on the sledge. He pushes the sledge, exiting the frame right.
12. PA of the postman (entering the frame from background left). He greets the newspaper man and exits the frame foreground right. The woman now enters the frame background left and exits foreground right. The boy then enters (background left) picks up the newspaper and exits (foreground right).
13. PA of postman crossing from right to left of the frame. In the background is the dairy. Inside is the milk woman. They greet each other. The postman exits left. The woman then enters right of the frame, followed shortly by the boy. After crossing the frame, the woman exits left and the boy enters the dairy shop.
14. LMS of worker digging a hole.
15. LS high angle shot of the hole and the worker. The postman avoids the hole, walking left to right of the frame. The woman enters left. The postman exits right.

16. MS of worker. He looks up off-screen left.
17. MS of woman looking down off-screen right. She avoids going along the path. TILT down to the boy who crosses behind her (right to the left of the frame).
18. LS of the postman (moving from right to left).
19. LS of television set and legs hanging in the air (from upper side of frame). TILT upwards to show man holding onto gymnastic rings.
20. LS (from the inside of the room in 19). Outside, behind the window the postman crosses from left to right.
21. Cont. of 19. The man continues exercising.
22. MS of man in 19 exercising (now on the floor). The man looks up off-screen right.
23. Cont. of 20. (now this is a subjective shot of 22). The woman crosses from left to right outside the window, with the boy following her. PAN right to a second window with shutters. The woman can be seen walking from left to right. The boy follows suit. PAN to a CU of the man in 19. He walks to the door of his apartment with the camera tracking behind. Through the letter box the woman is seen passing (from left to right) and going up the stairs.

There is no ES in this scene, even though, the opening shot with the credit titles looks like one. It is actually, if anything, a partial shot of the square. It seems to be an ES because of the size of its frame, an extreme long shot. But there are many elements of the scene which do not appear in this false ES (the garage, the pub, the old couple behind the window). And many of those elements which do appear would be identified only with difficulty in the subsequent shots, when they appear in full (for example, the dairy and the other shop next to it. The only three elements that are clearly established to each other in this opening shot, are the newspaper kiosk, the road works and the path.

And only two characters are thus established, the newspaper man and the worker digging the hole. The path is the strongest element unifying the scene but it only establishes topographically (unifies spatially) the journey from the newspaper kiosk to the road works. The rest have to be associated by the spectator, since there are no other visual references in this opening shot. The spectator has to associate the movement of the characters, the direction of their walking, with the path. The direction of the path is kept in concord with the direction of the characters in subsequent shots: the characters first move from left to right of the frame (shots 2-12)

and then from right to left (13-18) and, seen from the inside of the room, again left to right. This change in the direction indicates the spectator that the characters have passed the second loop in the path.

Apart from the direction of the characters the unity of the space is created by the appearance of the three characters who are walking along the path - the postman, the young woman, and the boy with the sledge - in each of the topographical references of the square (sometimes even together or successively in the same shot): the garage, the pub, the newspaper kiosk, the dairy, the shop, the road works, and the corner of the square (this seen from the inside of the building where the main character lives). Those topographical elements of the square not seen in the first shot nor established by means of the appearance of the characters in 'their' shot, that is, the old couple behind the window, are established by means of the gaze matches of the postman, the woman, and the boy successively. The garage is also established by means of the coat worn by the woman. Thus the spectator has a clear image of the square's topography, perceives the square as one whole space. Taking shot 1 as his/her reference the spectator would perceive that the garage and the bar lie off-screen under the lower frame of the shot on the left and the old couple are more or less opposite, in the right off-screen space.

Nevertheless, even though the spectator perceives the square as a whole, its inhabitants, the neighbours are shown separated and isolated from each other, not only within their respective frames but by physical barriers. The man under the car is inside his garage; the barman is seen behind a window, just like the old couple and the saleswoman from the dairy; the newspaper man is inside his kiosk and barely seen; and the worker is inside the hole. The neighbours do not seem to be bounded by anything. The neighbourhood is not a collective.

The sequence of this opening scene is repeated when the main character, Klíma, comes home. He follows the same path as the postman, the woman (who happens to be his girlfriend and who has decided that she is moving in), and the boy. Klíma greets the car mechanic, the pub landlord, the old couple, the newspaper man, and so on. This is done repeating the technique of the opening scene. The neighbours are still isolated. Two more other arrivals home are shown during the course of the film. In neither cases is an ES of the square is used.

To explain what happens next I have first to give a synopsis of the film. The film is based on a Kundera short story from Směsné lásky (Laughable loves). Dr

Klíma, a lecturer in art history, specialising in contemporary art, has been asked to review an article by an amateur academic, Záturecký. He is desperate for recognition and hopes he will receive it by means of Klíma's prestige in the field. Unfortunately, Klíma has lost the article and so he avoids Záturecký out of a sense of guilt. When Záturecký insists, Klíma is forced to find the article. He does so, only to realize that the article is appalling and has no academic merit whatsoever. Instead of either being straightforward about this to Záturecký or writing the review, once more Klíma avoids him, lying, giving excuses, even changing the hour of his lectures, to the point where Záturecký, stubborn and desperate as he is, starts believing that Klíma is suffering from personal and professional envy. Záturecký decides to confront Klíma in person to demand the review he deserves, and so he goes to Klíma's house. Klíma is not at home but Záturecký meets his girlfriend, Klára, who happens not to be officially registered at the house. Thinking that it is a good idea to get rid of Záturecký, Klíma accuses him of sexually assaulting his girlfriend. The plan backfires, though, and Klíma loses control of the situation. Záturecký takes the matter to the authorities (backed by his wife). Klára has to the leave the apartment (and decides to disappear from Klíma's life altogether) and Klíma is summoned to the weekly meeting of the neighbourhood committee where he is publicly criticised for his improper moral behaviour, (both for his professional envy of Záturecký and his illicit cohabitation with Klára) and he receives a reprimand (that is, he is threatened). All the neighbours of the square are present in this 'trial' and all join in an attack against Klíma - everyone has something to complain about. All the neighbours seen before separately are now seen together, in a common effort,unified as a collective in several ESs. They attack Klíma for being selfish and lacking solidarity towards a colleague. In a word, Klíma is attacked for being an individualist who is only interested in his own career and not in the collective building of a brighter Socialist future. The scene ends with Klíma, isolated, ignored, leaving the room unnoticed. The scene takes place in the evening.

The next scene takes place the next morning. It starts with an establishing shot of the square from the corner where the pub is situated. It is a long shot of Klíma as he leaves the gate of his home, walking onto the street (the camera PANS following him), greeting the man by the shop next to the road works, crossing to the kiosk, where he greets the newspaper man and picks up his newspaper, moving right to the foreground towards the pub (in the background the milkwoman greets him, he returns the

greeting), where the barman greets him in the street, and walking right along the path (in the background the old couple, now outside the window, cleaning it, greet him). One plan-sequence which shows all the neighbours outside their hiding places (except for the mechanic, who does not appear in the scene): no windows, no kiosk, and no frame to isolate them. Throughout the scene none of the characters ceases to observe Klíma, vigilantly, arrogantly.

Bočan, like the other New Wave directors, had shown the characters as individuals but once the machinery of oppression, repression, starts to function he shows them as a collective in an ES. The unity of the square as seen by means of the ES becomes, then, a symbol of the oppression by the collective of an individual who does not want to belong to that collective. The ES itself symbolizes the confrontation between the Socialist state and the individual. It can be speculated, then, that for the New Wave directors the ES symbolized, the collective, the Socialist state, the regime, the lies and official propaganda of this regime. Indeed, in Socialist Realist films of the 1950s most ESs portray the collective: workers, committees, public trials, official meetings of collective farms, groups of optimistic young people talking about the duties of a young socialist, a true socialist, sacrificing himself/herself for the common good, in order to build the dreamt-of Socialist state.

The same use of the ES as a symbol of oppression is to be found in Návrat ztraceného syna. The film tells the story of Jan, an engineer, who attempts suicide. Because of this attempt he is interned in a mental hospital. The spectator never knows the reason why he has attempted suicide. But he has to stay in the hospital. He attempts and fails to escape several times. The film ends with him remaining (indefinitely?) in the hospital.

The opening scene shows parts of the mental hospital seen through the interior of an ambulance (most probably, Jan's POV shots). Throughout the scenes the mental hospital is never shown in full but only partially. The characters, on the other hand, are shown in ES. Forty minutes into the film, Jan attempts once again to escape, and for a while he succeeds. One shot shows Jan running away. The next shot shows a full shot (ELS) of the mental institution. It is the ES of the building where the action has been taking place. At one level this could be interpreted as a subjective shot of Jan as he runs away from the building: he is far away now, and looks back at the building to see if anyone is following him. This will make all the shots in the film so far 'symbolically' subjective shots of Jan - indeed the entrance to the hospital inside the

ambulance was shot with a subjective camera (when one is by a building, next to its wall, one cannot see the whole building). This would be in line with the subjectivity employed in most of the New Wave films. At another level, however, the ES of the institution symbolizes the greater institution, that is, the State, in this case the Socialist state of Czechoslovakia. The building symbolizes the oppression and the feeling of being trapped experienced by Jan, that is, by an average citizen. The film can then be understood as an allegory of the Socialist state's oppression of the individual. This is supported by the closing shots of the film. It is a sequence of five shots. Two of them are ESs of the building. The first is a LS of the mental hospital. It is taken at dusk, against the light, so it forms a chiaroscuro composition, the light of the sky fading away, the building creating a big shadow. Some windows in the lower floors are lit. This shot gives a sense of anguish, menace, fear and despair, which is enhanced by the atonal music of the soundtrack. The next shot is a repetition of the ES when Jan is running away (this time in the dusk). From there the sequence cuts into a close-up of one of the lit windows, followed by an extreme close-up of the same window, cutting again to an even closer frame until the camera zooms into the white light, fading in white with the music at an unbearable pitch. It gives the feeling of someone being trapped within himself or within the institution, an oppressive State.

It can be argued, then, that the absence of the ES in the Czech New Wave films was a way of reacting against the collectivization, first of the characters and the stories carried out under the aesthetics of Socialist Realism. Secondly, a reaction against the forced collectivization of the society under the Communist regime. The absence of the ES is a return to the individualization of the characters, of returning individuality, uniqueness, differences to characters. The absence of the establishing states that a society is formed by the sum of its parts, that is, its individual members.

Within the Czechoslovak New Wave, the Slovak directors were less united a group than the Czech (seen for example, all together, in that famous series of photographs taken in 1967 to defend Chytilová's Sedmikrásky from the accusations of

formalism directed against it by the authorities).[47] Among the Slovak directors the employment of the non-ES technique was not wide spread and those who did employ it, did so only occasionally . If within the Slovak New Wave one includes Stefan Uher and Peter Solan from the older generation (those who studied at FAMU during the early 1950s and started to direct feature films in 1961/1962) and Dušan Hának, Elo Havetta, and Juraj Jakubisko fromthe younger generation (who studied at FAMU in the early 1960s and made their first feature films in the late 1960s), only Peter Solan , Juraj Jakubisko, and Dušan Hának make use of the non-ES technique. Of these three Jakubisko only makes use of the technique in his student films at FAMU, and then only sparsely. As soon as Jakubisko left FAMU he developed a radically different style, not only of editing but of cinema as a whole. Hának makes use of the technique only in 322 (1969) - perhaps one could say that Hának only had time to make use of the technique in one film because of the political and historical events that took place in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and 1969 and the repressive 'Normalization' that ensued. After 322 Hának developed a much more conventional style of editing in his feature films, though he retained some of the style found in 322 for his documentary films, for example in Obrazy starého sveta (Pictures from the old world,1972). Only Solan made a more regular use of the technique throughout the 1960s, although not in every film. Outside the New Wave there was another director who did employ the non-ES technique in Slovakia, the French director and writer Alain Robbe-Grillet. In his film Muž, ktorý luže (1968) (Man who lies), shot as a French-Slovak co-production in Slovakia, the absence of the ES is employed profusely, as will be discussed later, to question the validity of a narrative, that is, to question whether narrative , and a narrator (a first and third person narrator in this case) can be believed by the perceiver. The non-ES technique is employed by Robbe-Grillet as a tool to help him question the relationship between the story teller and the perceiver (listener/reader/spectator). This questioning of the narrative had already been the subject matter of Robbe-Grillet's previous film Trans-Europe-Express (1967), shot in France, in which a film director, a film producer and a secretary invent/imagine a detective story which is taking place simultaneously in the train on which they are travelling.[48]

Questioning the narrative as a means of discovering reality, taking uncertainty as the starting point, was a theme found in Czech and Slovak literature of the late

[47] BFI Companion to Eastern European..., p.52.
[48] I have not seen this film nor his next L'Eden et apres, (1970), also shot in Slovakia.

1950s, and early 1960s and in the Czech New Wave films, a theme which was synthesised with the theme of the isolation of individual characters. Both these themes are also recurrent in Slovak New Wave films starting with Uher's Slnko v sieti (Sun in a net, 1962) the film which marks the beginning of the whole Czechoslovak New Wave. Uher, however, employs the ES for spatial continuity, but otherwise the style of the film is similar to that of the Czech New Wave films: fast film stock, documentary-style footage, extensive use of CUs and POV shots, a loose plot, and so on. The film's narration is centred on Fajolo, a young man (first or second year at university), disenchanted with society as a whole, lonesome, and sometimes wishing he could be Robinson Crusoe alone in a deserted island, where life in its basic necessities for survival is real; real in its simplicity and authenticity. TV, radio, rock and roll and even collective farms can be done without. The portrayal of youth in this film is completely different from that seen in Socialist Realist films. During his summer holidays Fajolo is forced to join a brigáda (work camp) in the fields. The brigáda is compulsory. That is, Fajolo has not volunteered happily as any true Socialist young man would do in a Socialist Realist film (for example, Zítra se bude tančit všude). In fact, Fajolo is angry because he feels his summer will be wasted. He reluctantly joins the brigáda like all the other young people who are shown in the fields. On their first day at work, the foreman (manipulator) asks for volunteers to go to a particular field. For some time no one volunteers, but then a voluptuous looking young woman does. Around twenty young men, among them Fajolo, follow suit. The group is sent by tractor to the field (one of the few tractors seen, most of the equipment is manipulated manually or driven by mules). During the journey there is no happiness, no enthusiasm, no joyful socialist spirit, no singing among the young people in the tractor. The foreman, trying to raise morale, starts singing a socialist pseudo-folk song but remains the sole tenor. The young men and the girl later try to sing a twist but there is no collective spirit, no co-ordination, and each sings separately. Once they get to the fields the state of affairs is not very joyful either. Most of the machinery is broken or rusty, abandoned.

Through Fajolo the film also centres on the opposition between the city and the countryside, not the country side created by the Socialist collectives, but that of the individual peasants who have worked all their lives in the fields, who are the bearers of ancient traditions of harmony with the fields. This was the peasant life before collectivisation, a life that revolved around natural agricultural cycles.

Nature is further extolled with the portrayal of the Danube. It is always shown

peaceful. Likewise the people who live off it and understand what the river means, a live-giving artery crossing central and eastern Europe are also shown to be peasant. Such is the case of a retired sailor, who now in his old age spends his time fishing from his floating hut on the Danube. He and his wife live a quiet, contemplative life on the pontoon. In one occasion, referring to the wisdom of Nature as opposed to the industrialised society of the city, the old man says that the 'Danube will still be here', once he has gone, once everybody has gone.

Like other New Wave films there exists in Slnko v sieti a confrontation or rather a separation between generations. Fajolo is never seen together with his parents. His mother is never seen, only heard on the other side of the door, reprimanding him or telling him to come to the table for dinner, while Fajolo is in his room developing photographs. His father reprimands Fajolo off-screen while Fajolo prepares himself something to eat. Likewise, Bela, Fajolo's girlfriend, is distant from her mother, who is blind; that is, she is physically and symbolically isolated within herself, from her children and the world (the older generation cannot see reality).

Both themes of the individual's isolation and the search for reality are synthesised in Fajolo's passion for photography, that is, the objectivity and subjectivity inherent in the medium. It is through Fajolo's photographic camera (most of the POV shots of the film are Fajolo's point of view as seen through the camera) that reality is revealed. This is synthesised in a POV shot (from Fajolo's point of view) of a photograph gradually appearing under the developing liquids. The objective reality achieved by the camera (and the film) is then manipulated subjectively by Fajolo. He is mainly interested in people's hands, and after developing the photographs he erases, with the help of the developing liquids everything but the person's hand(s). Photography, then, represents the duality of the cinematographic medium: objective in its documentary quality; subjective in that it is a means of expression (of an individual). Fajolo only photographs individuals, never groups, not even pairs. It is through photographing individuals that Fajolo discovers reality: by photographing (and talking to and befriending) the old peasant in the fields Fajolo understands more about what the fields really are, how one should adapt oneself to natural cycles in agriculture; by photographing (and talking to and befriending) the old sailor at the pontoon hut Faiolo understands more about the fragility of human life as opposed to the strength of the river, of Nature. He is discovering, then, the traditional values and wisdom reatined by old pre-industrialised people, which the film seems to

argue is the true reality. Technically, Uher does not employ the non-ES to portray these themes (isolation, the search for reality). Several scenes with no ES take place in the pontoon-hut but the opening shot of the film is a LS/PAN of the pontoon-hut, thus establishing the hut with its surroundings. The shot is quite long, giving the spectator time to to familiarize himself/herself with the topography of the place. And nevertheless the non-ES scenes that take place in the pontoon-hut do portray the characters as individuals, although not as emphatically as it would have been the case had the ES been absent altogether. Likewise, Uher employs the ES in those scenes where the POV shots of what Fajolo sees through the camera lens are shown: the object seen through the lens is previously shown in ES with Fajolo. Uher has other techniques to portray isolation. For example, he uses parallel editing (a technique where, incidentally, no ES is needed) in a sequence to juxtapose the overcrowding (collectivisation) of public swimming pools (artificial water) where the water is barely visible because of the sheer numbers of bathers, with Fajolo's isolation, bathing alone in the Danube (natural, real water) or walking along its empty banks. In other sequences Uher shows the old peasant or the old sailor mostly through open windows (a frame within a frame) or reflected (either from mirrors, closed windows or the Danube's water) thus emphasising the isolation of individual characters. Finally, Fajolo is isolated, individualized by being shown in a shot through the net which the old sailor uses to fish (and to cool wine in the Danube). Previously the sun's reflection on the Danube had been shown in the same way (hence the title). Fajolo is trapped, isolated, but through his camera he will escape.

It is in this film that Uher gets closest to the non-ES technique. His previous film, My z deviatej A (We, from class 9A, 1961) is conventional in style and techniques, even retaining some Socialist Realist aesthetics, regarding editing, composition, mis-en-scene, and use of colour. In later films, the ES is always used conventionally even when Uher turns to an abundant use of shots with mirrors (for example, in Organ [1963] most if the church's interior is seen, and even established spatially, through the mirrors the organist has to see the priest and/or the orchestra's conductor) and of POV shots (as in Panna zázračnica [The miraculous maiden, 1966] based on ashort novel by Dominik Tatarka).

It is Peter Solan who employs the non-ES technique most amongst the Slovak directors, although only in two of his five 1960s films. In the same year that Uher shot

Slnko v sieti, Solan directed his second feature film, Boxer a smrt (The boxer and death). His first feature film had been a detective story, Muž ktorý sa nevrátil[49] (The man who did not return,1959).

In Boxer a smrt, Solan does not employ the non-Es technique, but like Uher in Slnko v sieti, he comes close to it. Similar in style to Uher's film, Boxer a smrt contains an abundance of CUs and MSs and a profuse employment of the subjective camera to convey the boxer's point of view, particularly while he is boxing and when he is allowed to leave the concentration camp to run as part of his training. The POV shots in this latter scenes recall those found in Kurosawa's Rashomon (1950) where LS shots of the main character walking through the forest are interwoven with low angle shots of the sun seen through the branches of the trees (shots of a type which as repeated by Tony Richardson in The Loneliness of the Long Distance Runner [1962], again while the main character is running as part of his training. Richardson's film, based on Sillitoe's novel, concerns a young man arrested for burglary and sent to a borstal. There he excels in running and he is allowed to leave the borstal alone in the morning to train). The main difference from Uher's film is that Boxer a smrt is shot mostly in interiors, in studio conditions, but one finds the recurrent themes of individualization and of the responsibility the character bears when having to make moral choices which will confront him to the collective (of prisoners).

Ján Kominek, an amateur boxer, finds himself in a German concentration/extermination camp. Like anybody else his sole preoccupation is to survive each day. Once, during a regular humiliation session of punishment carried out by German officers, the commandant of the camp notices that Ján has the typical boxer's broken nose. The commandant himself is an amateur boxer, but unfortunately for him he has no one to box with, and has to train alone. He is bored. He sees in Ján an opportunity at least to have a sparring partner. Ján is thus picked out of his group and given privileges: more food, no hard work and the assurance that the other German officers and soldiers will leave him alone; Ján has no longer has to fear being shot in the back gratuitously at the whim of a German guard. Now, Ján's sole preoccupation is to train; his sole duty towards the camp's commanding officer is to eat his extra rations, to train and to spar. Towards himself Ján has the same duty as before, to survive, but now he has boxing, fighting his death with his own fists. The other prisoners isolate him accusing him of treachery and selfishness (he does not

[49]I have not been able to see this film.

share his food in the hut). It is now that the conflict with his conscience starts. Before he was just one more anonymous prisoner, but now he stands out. Everybody knows him, he is the Slovak who spars with the commandant , the prisoner who has privileges.

But (the film retains many of the topoi of Socialist Realism) Ján finds a mentor in an old Polish prisoner, who is a Communist, and happens to be a boxing coach. Not only does he coach Jan on how to defeat the commandant, but also there arises in Ján a feeling of commraderie which increases when the Pole is shot in the back by the camp's second-in-command. The Pole had introduced Ján to the Communist cell which is organizing an escape. Since he is allowed to run outside, he will serve as messenger between the cell and the Resistance outside. However, Ján has only been allowed outside once, after which the commandant seems to have entered a period of bad mood, in which Ján is out of favour, and he does not allow him to go out again. Ján has been improving his physical strength and his boxing considerably, prompting the commandant to organize an 'official' match before his friends and fellow officers (some of them from outside the camp). At this match Ján dares knock the commandant down on several occasions, humiliating him before his peers. Even though the command is declared the winner of the match he is furious with Ján. Later, in private they spar one more round, where Ján releases all his fury (at being a prisoner, at the war, at his comrade's senseless death), badly injuring the commandant and defeating him by knock-out. Ján's privileges are automatically taken away from him and at the suggestion of the second-in-command he is taken out to be shot. Instead, the commandant rewards Ján for his sparring with freedom, allowing him to escape. Ján does so knowing that he will be able to contact the Resistance, but knowing also that the alarm will be set off, his escape reported and therefore forty of his fellow prisoners shot dead as an example. Ján now has to decide: save himself and have forty men over his conscience, and probably make the planned escape impossible, or warn the Resistance of the escape and return to the camp knowing that he is going back to a certain death. He chooses the latter.

The film does indeed contain many elements of Socialist Realist narrative, although without being schematic nor propagandistic. There is here much more emphasis on the individual than there is in Socialist Realism, the emphasis lies on the personal fight carried out by Ján and the choices he has to make under certain circumstances. Ján has the choices, unlike in Socialist Realism where characters'

decisions are determined by the forces of History. Ján finds himself in an historical context but can decide, to a certain extent, his destiny. Ján wants to survive; that is his right as a human being, and that is his challenge throughout the film. He sacrifices his right of his own free will. Furthermore, Ján's choice and dilemma at the end of the film is not portrayed as a political choice, that is Ján helps the Communist not out of political convictions but as a personal favour to his late friend and because he can help; Ján returns to the camp not because he is conscious of the fight against Fascism and that his sacrifice will result in the building of an ideal Socialist state, but because forty lives are at stake and he can save those lives (even if only perhaps momentarily). In other words, Ján is not fighting a collective fight but is an individual who has taken personal decisions based on specific situations that affect him personally.

Ján's second challenge is to defeat the commandant , for his own pride. At the beginning Ján trains only to survive, to be fit and to be able to withstand the commandant's blows, not only for what that means physically, but also because if he is unsuccesful as a sparring partner the commandant will send him back among the other prisoners or, worse, kill him on the spot. Once he starts progressing, he has to be careful not to excel toogreatly, since becoming better than the commandant might again send him straight to the crematorioum.

Another element which Solan shares with other New Wave directors is the subjectivization of reality. As already discussed, Uher employs POV shots through Faiolo's photographic camera to explore this subjectivity. Solan also employs the POV. There is one POV shot in particular at the end of the film that illustrates the director's intention. Throughout the film a recurrence of inserts, whether objective shots or POV shots, of thecrematorioum's chimney, and of the smoke coming out of it, have appeared, thus referring the spectator to the systematic mass murder of Jews, Gypsies and other 'undesirables'by the Germans. The POV in question is shown after Jan is allowed to escape. Once he reaches the first trees of the forest that surrounds the camp, Jan looks back to see the camp for one last time (thinking probably of the forty men who will die because of his escape, making up his mind what to do). The POV shot that follows shows a LS of the camp, with the chimney in a prominent place of the composition. In the foreground of the shot there are a few of trees (thus telling the spectator that Ján is already safe in the forest). At one moment of the shot the camera PANs and one of the trees in the foreground covers the chimney. The camera remains there for a significantly long moment. The chimney does not exist anymore. If Ján

wishes that is the reality, his subjective reality, the only one that exists for him. He can, if chooses, ignore the reality that is behind the tree; the reality that hundreds of corpses are incinerated daily in the camp, he can ignore the fact that forty prisoners will die and be incinerated. The camera then PANs back to reveal the chimney again. Ján has decided not to ignore reality. One could, then, argue that Ján chooses objective reality over his own subjective reality. With this POV technique, even though he does not go as far as leaving the ES out, Solan is posing questions about reality and the mediation of that reality.

It is in his next film, Tvár v okně (the face in the window, 1963), that Solan starts employing the non-ES technique, mainly to juxtapose the individual (and the young) to the state (and the old). The film comprises three stories: Žalobca (public prosecutor); Obhajca (defence counsel); and Súdca (judge); that is, the three elements that compose the judicial system. They are introduced by a prologue, a sequence whose opening shot is a POV shot from inside a room looking out onto the streets through a half open window which opens completely at the same time as the voice of the narrator begins his narration. The voice of the narrator speaks in the first person plural about the town where the three stories take place ('our town, our problems'). It is a voice that does not belong to any of the characters seen later (nor is the narrator heard after the prologue). The narrator might be a simple citizen of the town, or might be someone who belongs to some official institution or to the administration of the town, or it could so be the voice of the implied author of the film (director, screenwriter). The narrator describes the town, its people, its problems but visually there is no ES of the town seen as a whole. Instead, shots of the houses, of a group of windows, of single windows, and of several prefrabicated high-rise style blocks of flats are shown. The quantity of shots of the blocks, shown both in full and partially, outnumbers the rest. The narrator seems to be complaining about the significant expansion undergone by the town: now the town is larger and has new and more complex problems, new people and new needs - the tranquillity and simple life of days gone by has disappeared. Solan employs in this sequence a similar effect to that of the POV shot of Boxer a smrt which questions reality. In one of the few LS of the sequence showing what is probably the main square of the town (an ES of the square), Solan places a sheet of glass being transported by two men between the camera (the shot film) and the square (reality, the object being filmed). At the beginning of the shot the sheet of glass (probably a shop window) is not noticed by the spectator since

there is no frame to reveal the size of the sheet of glass as it is being carried. It is only noticed when the men carry it out of frame to the right, that is, when the frame of the window ceases to coincide with that of the screen. S two framesare seen. Solan thus questions the camera's ability to record reality. He seems to be saying that as a director he is removing any obstacle between the camera and reality, but also that he is at the same time questioning whether he has removed that obstacle, that is, whether what is being recorded in the film is an objective reality or the director's search (subjectivity) for that reality. This window pane couples with the opening POV shot taken through the window. Likewise, not showing the ES of the town (for example, an ELS bird's-eye view of the town) stresses the subjectivity and therefore uncertainty of the narrative. The narration is recounted by a narrator who does not appear again in the film. His 'mysterious' disappearance questions the validity of his narration.

Within the film, though, the absence of the ES takes place only in two of the three stories, in Žalobca and Súdca. In the former the non-ES scene is a scene where some youngsters are being tried on charges of hooliganism (officially), in fact of enjoying dancing the twist (unofficially). The accused and the triumvirate of judges are never shown in ES, which emphasizes the confrontation between two generations, that is, between the problems of the old, simple, quiet little town and the new problems of an overcrowded, busy industrial town. This juxtaposition can be further applied to the confrontation between the individual freedom to choose what one likes (jazz, rock-and-roll, the twist) and a restricting order common to all (a community's law). This juxtaposition is embodied in the public prosecutor, a young man who plays the trumpet in the local jazz/rock band. A similar use of the non-ES technique is found in the third story, Súdca, where a judge refuses to divorce a young couple. The institution of marriage has changed. Before married couples would put up with anything to save the marriage (as is the case of the judge's own marriage), but now young people want a divorce shortly after marrying, which according to the judge is only because othe couple are going through their first quarrel. The young couple and the judge are only shown together in ES in the scenes taking place in the judge's private life (for example, after work at his place where the couple goes to look for him in order to convince him they need a their divorce). In court the judge is not shown with the couple in ES. Again public and private life are clearly separated by the use of the non-ES technique.

Similarly, Solan conveys the barrier between the individual and the authorities

by means of the absence of the ES in Prípad Barnabáš Kos (the Barnabáš Kos Case, 1964). It is in this film where Solan uses the non-ES technique most frequently. Barnabáš Kos is a musician who plays the triangle in a symphony orchestra. He is an insipid, discreet bachelor who has no friends. This lack of socialization is the probable reason for his being heavily engaged in propaganda activities outside his triangle playing; he spends most of his free time in voluntary work-brigades building socialism. It could be argued that he is a redundant person, just as the instrument he plays in the orchestra, the triangle, which in each piece is only needed for one or two bars, at the most. One day, he receives an official letter (from the Ministry of Culture?) stating that he has been appointed the new manager of the orchestra. Incredulous at the information he has just read, he believes there must have been a mistake, and so he tries to return the letter, but to no avail. There has been no mistake. He is indeed the new manager of the orchestra. He then tries to learn why he has been appointed to the post and if there is any chance that the decision will be revoked; he is after all only a triangle player. In a Kafkaesque tour de force he seeks out the authorities in their own territory. The authorities tell him that he has been appointed because he was the only choice possible since as the most insipid and dullest member of the orchestra he will not cause any problems. He finally seeks out the most senior bureaucrat to try to ensure the revocation of the decision. But this person just confirms him in the post (and gives him as a present a lighter which plays some music when lighted, and this makes Kos feel special). Kos finally accepts the post and starts to fulfil his duties with zeal, but the orchestra has still not appointed a substitute triangle player, so Kos still has to attend the rehearsals. In fact, he misses playing the triangle, and since he is the person who has to appoint the new triangle player he decides not to appoint anyone. His presence at the rehearsals makes the musicians and the conductor uncomfortable: Kos is at the same time the least important player and the highest authority in the orchestra. Gradually Kos realizes that the triangle is in fact not an unnecessary, anonymous, insipid instrument but one which has much to express. Under the protection of his new position (and given the impotence of conductor and orchestra alike), Kos starts playing the triangle whenever he thinks it can express something and contribute to the musical piece which is being played, even if nothing is written in the score for the triangle. Kos becomes more and more despotic, disrupting and taking over the rehearsals, even dismissing a trumpet player for complaining. His tyranny reaches a climax when he commissions a concerto for

triangle solo. (This concerto has been dramatically anticipated by previously showing the composer commissioned waiting to be received by Kos's predecessor playing cards [patience; that is, a solo game] on a small triangular table. This image symbolically tells the spectator that the composer is wasting his time with the concerto.) The concerto is a complete fiasco. Nobody, neither the orchestra nor the audience, nor the authorities understand the concerto. Kos is dismissed from the post and returns to his lonely anonymous life as a triangle player, more isolated than ever within the orchestra.

Kos's isolation from the orchestra is stressed in the opening sequence shot of the film, an ES of the whole orchestra rehearsing. The camera tracks in from the ELS to a MS of an empty chair with a triangle placed in front. Kos is the odd man out, by his absence in this orchestra, in this ES. As Chytilová argues, an ES holds back information as well as giving it. In this case the ES 'hides' Kos away. When Kos arrives late (because of his propaganda activities), he joins the orchestra, and so is restored to the ES. Kos is now part of the orchestra, part of a collective, and at the same time he is not; he is a man who has been singled out. Once Kos aquires power, he makes every effort to emphasize this. Power gives him the chance to turn his individuality into the essence of the central person of the orchestra, the person who becomes the raison d'être of the orchestra. The orchestra (collective) becomes the instrument of Kos (the individual). The film seems to say that we are all individuals; even in a collective we all have our individual characters and personalities which differentiate us from the others. For this reason, each member of a collective is necessary for the collective since he/she plays a role specific to each member, however small this role. The film asks the question where the balance lies between maintaining one's own singularity and the proper functioning of a collective of which one is a member. Kos develops his individuality to despotic levels disrupting the harmony and hierarchy which assures the functioning of the orchestra; as a result the orchestra falls into total chaos and ceases to play its role in society. The question posed by the film is, then, where the boundary between man's free will and the proper functioning of a society lies. If the ambitions of a man are unchecked the result is the disintegration of society.

The film shows the harmony of a collective disrupted thanks to the communist authorities, who confer power on someone who is not prepared for it. The films describes a distant authority which promotes and manipulates a common person,

because it thinks his mediocrity will not pose a threat to its power. This complete segregation of the manipulative and remote official authorities from the ordinary citizen is conveyed by the absence of the ES in the scenes where Kos tries to have his appointment as director of the orchestra revoked.

In the first scene Kos goes to the Ministry to complain that a mistake has been made in his appointment. Inside the building the scene starts as follows:

1.MCU of a woman walking along a corridor (from the right to the left of the screen). There is a PAN left to a LS. The LS shows a corridor of glass bricks with windows where bureaucrats stick their heads out looking at the woman. The whole shot transmits a sense of claustrophobia.
2.MCU of the same woman (walking from left to right). The camera PANs right to show Kos, with the woman exiting the frame right. The camera tracks to the right. The spectator would expect to see the woman but she is nowhere to be seen. Only a corridor with closed doors is shown. A man enters the frame from the left. Kos asks him if this is the second floor. The man drinks water from a small fountain at the corridor. Kos looks at him.
3.CU of man (in 2) drinking water. Relatively high angle shot; it is a POV shot from Kos.
4.CU of Kos looking off-screen right. Starts talking but suddenly stops, surprised.
5.LS of empty corridor. Kos enters the frame from left (that is, this shot behaves like a POV shot at the beginning and now becomes an objective shot). PAN left to reveal another man drinking water at the fountain. PAN left again to show Kos knocking on a door. He turns round to his right (the camera PANs right). The man has disappeared.
6.MCU of bureaucrat I (Vavro) looking right. Kos is heard in voice-off (saying it is a mistake). Vavro gives him all his personal details, for example, what food he likes and so on.
7.MCU of Kos looking left listening to Vavro's words.
8.MS of bureaucrat II (Vavrus) looking right describing Kos's character (discreet, and so on).
9.MS of Kos looking left, listening.
10.LS of bureaucrat III (Vavrik), looking right.
11.LS of Kos looking left (Vavrik's voice-off can be heard). Behind Kos the legs of a statue can be seen through the window.

12.MS of Kos looking left. A different voice-off is heard, that of Vavro or Vavrus, (they are indistinguishable) stating that it has been Comrade Vavrečka who appointed him personally.
13.CU of Kos looking left. The statue behind Kos seems to be that of Stalin.
14.LS/low angle of the three bureaucrats Vavro, Vavrus, and Vavrik looking down out of the window and saying that Kos is a suspicious character.
15.ELS/high angle of Kos as walks across an empty square with the menacing shadow of the huge statue.

The sense of claustrophobia and mystery is conveyed by the first shots of the scene; a sense of helplessness is emphasised by the juxtaposition of Kos and the bureaucrats through the absence of the ES. Not even the building itself is shown from the outside (except for part of the window from where the bureaucrats watch Kos as he leaves). This place will never be accessible to the ordinary man; he will always be kept away from the institution which governs and manipulates him. Furthermore, the authorities are an indistinguishable mass, a collective with no individuals, no singular characters since the difference between bureaucrats is minimal even in the names (Vavro, Vavrus, Vavrik, Vavrečka). This is a parody of Communists and of the Communist Party.

Kos's despair makes him seek the 'chief comrade' Vavrečka at his home. Solan not only uses the non-ES technique in order not to show Kos and Vavrecka together, but he does not show Vavrečka at all (not only in this scene, but throughout the film, except in one shot during the concert for triangle solo where he is seen in the Party bosses' box, but this shot is an ELS and Vavrečka's face cannot be distinguished); this stresses the remoteness and inaccessibility of the authorities for the common man. The dialogue between Kos and Vavrečka takes place during a shot-reverse-shot sequence where shots of Kos are interwoven with shots of a bathroom door ajar, through which Vavrečka, who is taking a bath, talks. The shots of Kos are relatively high angle and Kos is looking up as if he were talking to God. Indeed, the seemingly abstract composition of one of the shots of the bathroom door forms the shape of a triangle with the bathroom lamp in the middle. This recreates the symbol of God (a burning triangle with an eye in the middle). The triangle also refers to the composer's patience table and ultimately to Kos's instrument.

Only Kos as an individual is never shown in an ES with the authorities. There

is an ES when the musicians send a delegation (the principal conductor [who has been relegated by Kos], the composer in residence [again relegated by Kos who has commissioned the concerto from someone outside the orchestra], and the trumpet player [fired by Kos]) to the very same bureaucrats to complain about Kos's despotism and the chaos being experienced by the orchestra. But this time the bureaucrats are seen (all together) behind glass, which again symbolizes their inaccessibility. The bureaucrats state that Kos has been appointed manager of the orchestra for reasons that the musicians do not need to know. At the end of the film the bureaucrats, who have not attended the premiere of the concerto, appear at the party, or rather crash the party (which has been attended by the composer of the concerto, his wife, and the conductor of the piece), and cruelly mock Kos, an individual who has been crushed by the authorities, and by himself once he started behaving in the same way as the distant authorities.

Solan is beginning to abandon the non-ES technique in his next film, Kým sa skončí tato noc (Until this night ends, 1965). Solan still uses profusely CUs and MSs and POV shots but always with the inclusion in the sequence of the ES. In a plot that unfolds in a night club at a mountain resort, where two young men pick up some girls, the night club is repeatedly shown in ES and in partial ES. There is, though, a mysterious, unidentified character, a young man, who arrives at the night club too early, just when it is about to be opened. There are no customers, and no atmosphere, and so he decides to return later. This sequence is shot with no ES, the shot showing the night club is a panoramic POV shot from the young man. The shot showing the young man on the stairs leading down to the night club from the street entrance is a POV shot from the surprised staff. The spatial continuity is achieved by the eye-match of the waiters and the young man. The young man returns later but then the night club is completely full and he is not allowed in. Again the ES is not shown. It is only when the young man arrives for the third time, at dawn, that the ES is used. The club is now closed; all the customers have left, and the young man is seen alone finally in the dance floor (before he had not got beyond the stairs). He represents an individual who has not been allowed to integrate into the community.

Solan's next film is his contribution to Dialog 20 40 60 (1968), a film consisting of three medium length stories which share exactly the same dialogue but each time spoken by different characters of different ages: the character of the first story is twenty years old; that of the second forty; of the third sixty. The plot of the

dialogue is a crisis in the relationship between a man and a woman. The challenge of the directors was to provide the images and thus the context of the dialogue. The Pole Jerzy Skolimowski directs 20, Solan 40, and the Czech Zbyněk Brynych 60. It is not Solan who employs the non-ES technique in this film but surprisingly Brynych (whose editor in the film is Miroslav Hájek, editor of many New Wave films). I say surprisingly, because (as far as I know) he uses this technique here for the first and last time. It could be argued that the non-ES technique was a natural development of Brynych's style of editing, based on the close shots - CU and MS. Both Skolimowski and Solan contextualize the dialogue within a similar situation.. Brynych takes the experiment further. He puts the crisis theme in a stage play. The main character of the story is the old prompter who is suffering from an obsessive infatuation for the leading lady. Brynych, by making the prompter repeat some of the lines of the dialogue (from the play) creates an abstract dialogue between the leading lady and the prompter; the spectator does not know whether it has in fact taken place. It makes the dialogue atemporal, and this atemporality is emphasized by the insertion of flashes which do not belong to what is taking place on stage. They could refer to the prompter's imagination or to his memory. Therefore the spectator is not certain whether the prompter is imagining a relationship with the leading lady due to his infatuation or whether the prompter is remembering an actual relationship which they had had in the past. Perhaps the prompter was also an actor who has fallen from grace both from the public and the leading lady. It could even be that the leading lady as a femme fatale had caused the actor's downfall. Expressing all this uncertainty regarding the plot is aided by the adoption of the non-ES technique. The prompter (or his booth) is never seen in an ES including the stage or any of the actors. The stage itself is never shown in an ES but only in partial shots, most of them POV shots from the prompter. Thus the spectator sees the stage subjectivized by the prompter. The POV shots of the stage, then, are juxtaposed with the flashes from the prompter's mind which creates a thin line between reality and unreality. The spectator must rather interpret what is real and what is not. Perhaps not even the play is taking place on the stage; it might be the product of the prompter's imagination, since in most of the CUs the prompter has his eyes closed, which questions the nature of the POV shots that follow. Technically they are POV shots, but if the character, whose point of view the spectator is supposed to be watching, has his eyes shut, the spectator asks himself/herself whether he/she is watching what the prompter sees or what he imagines. Nothing in the story is clear,

everything is uncertain, everything is questioned: the plot, film time, film space.

Juraj Jakubisko's editing style changes dramatically once he leaves FAMU. His student shorts follow a similar editing style to that of contemporary New Wave films: an abundance of close shots (CU, MS) not very long in length with scenes occasionally edited without the ES. His feature films of the late 1960s abandon this style and gradually develop a dynamic hand held camera with little cutting. To my question as to why he edited his student shorts the way he did, Jakubisko answered that at FAMU he made films for his fellow students and to please the former students now in the New Wave.[50] He also said that, once he left FAMU he started making films for the audience. Whatever the reasons, it is clear from his student shorts that at the time he was under a strong influence of the New Wave directors (he even worked in some of the productions, as in Chytilová's Strop) and perhaps also of Kučera. He employs the non-ES technique for the same purposes as his New Wave contemporaries, that is, to emphasise the isolation and individualization of the character. His hand held camera later substitutes the non-ES technique for this aim. The themes of isolation and individualization are already present in Mlčanie (Silence, 1963). An old radio broadcaster is relieved of his duties (his programme about contemporary 'serious' music is cancelled) for no apparent reason. He is told that people do not listen to the music he plays on the programme anymore, when in fact his programme is quite popular. He is told that people do not want to listen to experiments, but to Mozart. The vehicle for this plot is the old broadcaster's monologue narrating what has happened, or remembering moments in his programme and his life. The monologue is the main tool employed here by Jakubisko to isolate the character. The short is shot in wide screen, almost entirely in CUs and MSs but each scene has an ES of the space where the broadcaster is. There are, though, CU inserts (for example of a violinist) which do not belong anywhere spatially. These inserts probably refer to the broadcaster's memory.

In his next short, Dažď (Rain, 1965) Jakubisko does leave the ES out from one sequence, the opening sequence inside a car. Again, his final year project film Čakanie na Godota (Waiting for godot, 1966) contains a shot-reverse-shot sequence with no ES. The action of the short takes place during the night before the departure of a group of friends to their military service. They celebrate the farewell with a party, during which they 'wait' for a miracle to happen that would remove their obligations to do

[50] In a NFT interview carried out by Peter Hames, London, March, 2004.

military service. The shot-reverse-shot technique is employed during the dream sequence of one of the boys. More significantly the railway station from which the boys depart is not shown in an ES. The train and the platform are shot partially, in other words their departure from real life is shot partially. Jakubisko never fully develops the non-ES technique. It seems that in his short films the non-ES technique is also not exploited fully, that Jakubisko was not interested in it.

As in other New Wave films, Hának employs the non-ES technique in 322 mainly to subjectivize the narration around one character. It so happens that 322 is loosely based on the short story by Ján Johanides[51] (who collaborates in the script) Potápeča pritahujú prameni mora[52] which has an Ich-narrator. The short story concerns a man who is diagnosed as having cancer. He works in a hotel kitchen as a cook and is married, although he and his wife do not have a life in common. His wife, Marta, sleeps around, but he accepts this as he accepts most of what happens to him, including the cancer. This is in broad terms also the basic plot of the film. One difference in the film is that the couple are not married but divorced, although they still live together due to the housing shortage. Also the ex-wife, Marta, in the film does not sleep around but has a stable sexual relationship with a younger colleague from work. The film develops her plot line more than the short story. The main character, Lauko, however, is portrayed in the same way, a passive man who is diagnosed as having cancer (322 is the number of his illness) who has no ambitions, ideals or dreams, who accepts everything as it comes. At the same he is portrayed as an good honest man.

During the first half of the film most of the scenes in which Lauko takes part have no ES. This concentration of non-ES subsides in the second half, increasing again towards the end of the film. Most of these non-ES scenes are constructed by means of POV shots based on Lauko, on Lauko as passive observer. In other words, the non-ES technique isolates the character and makes him the medium of the narration. Isolation is a theme of Johanides's short stories, where 'the individual is depicted as essentially alone and unable to communicate with his fellows'.[53] Alone and unable to communicate, Lauko may be, but in the film he can however observe the objective reality around him, subjectivising thus a reality that apparently has no

[51] Not credited in the film. The credit titles state that it is based on an story by Johanides without specifically referring to the short story.
[52] From the collection of short stories Súkromie, Bratislava, 1963.
[53] Entry on Johanides in R.B. Pynsent and S. I. Kanikova (eds), The Everyman Companion to East European Literature.

direct connection with the plot except in as far as it isolates Lauko.

The opening scene of the film which takes place in the streets and where Lauko is beaten up by three youngsters, makes use of a subjective off-screen space with no ES. Shots of Lauko are followed by his POV shots of a man riding a bicycle , of a dog, and of a group of youths who are insulting and threatening to hit a young woman. Once the younths notice Lauko watching them they take it out on him, 'enter' his shot and hit him. The beating is observed by an old man from another shot, again with no ES. The shot where the beating takes place, then, becomes the POV shot from the old man. The observer is observed. But it is worth noting that when observed Lauko is not an active but a passive agent - he does not even try to defend himself.

In the street one can be anonymous and isolated (although Lauko's passivity even fails to achieve this) but that is not so easy at work, one of the places where a person necessarily socializes. The subjectivity of the non-ES isolates Lauko from his fellow workers. The kitchen where Lauko works is introduced with noES. The scene starts as follows:

1.CU of a cook looking at himself in the mirror. PAN to the right and re-focusing to the background where an assistant cook, seen in plan-americain (PA), is peeling potatoes. PAN/TILT further to the right to show a waiter, in MCU, smoking and saying that he is still waiting for the steak, and looking off-screen down left.
2.MCU of cook taking out the bone marrow. PAN/TILT to the left to a CU of Lauko seen over a cooking pot looking off-screen down right.
3.CU of a fellow cook and of one of the few friends of Lauko, Cilka. She looks up off-screen left. TILT down to Cilka chopping an onion.
4.Cont of 2. Lauko tries the soup.
5.CU of four glasses half filled with juice and being filled up with water.
6.LS (of shot 5.) match on action. The waiter seen in shot 1 is adding water to the juice glasses. A waitress enters the shot left and whispers something in his ear. Both exit the frame left, at the same time as the chef enters the frame right in the foreground in CU. PAN left to show Cilka in CU.
7.LS (similar to the opening LS in 6.) of Lauko entering the frame left putting the glasses of watered down juice to one side and filling new glasses with only juice. He says that he has been to the doctor.
8.MCU of the chef looking off-screen left asking Lauko what is wrong.

9.Cont. of 7 with the chef's voice-off.

The scene opens with a POV shot from Lauko followed by a shot which seems at the beginning to be a second POV shot from Lauko, but which becomes an objective shot of Lauko. This is the means by which the scene is constructed, to give it spatial unity. After every one or two POV shots from Lauko (shots 1. 3. 5. 6. 8.) there follows a shot on Lauko (2. 4. 7. 9.). Some of these transitions are done eye-matching (like the transition from 3 to 4). The PAN and TILT of the camera included in the POV shots from Lauko emphasis the subjectivity since they represent the movement of Lauko's head as he observes here and there what is taking place in the kitchen. But in this scene the observer might also be being observed. I do not mean by Cilka or by the chef, who do observe Lauko in their shot-reverse-shot sequences with him (Cilka in shots 2 to 4; the chef in shots 7 to 9). I am referring to shot 2: this shot gives the impression of starting as a second POV shot from Lauko; it contains a PAN and TILT to represent Lauko's head movements; but at the end of the shot Lauko appears. The logic of the scene tells one that it might be Cilka or the chef, but later in the film more hand held camera shots on Lauko, with no corresponding reverse objective shot of a character observing Lauko, are shown. This is the case of several transitional sequences of Lauko in the street. In one of them Lauko is seen riding a scooter in several shots. The shots are taken from a hand held camera at the height of someone sitting inside a car in the traffic and of someone standing on the other side of the street. The subjectivity inherent in this hand held camera is emphasised by the style and composition of the shots, where there is always something partially covering Lauko, that is, recreating the conditions of visibility one has in the middle of traffic or across the street. Lauko is being observed but the source of the subjectivity is not revealed. If Lauko is not being observed by a character one can speculate that it might be by the spectator. The director is consciously drawing the spectator into the narrative. This is taking place simultaneously with Lauko's subjective narration. The first scene at the hospital which follows the first scene at the kitchen again contains no ES. It starts as follows:

1.ECU of a piece of paper inside a typewriter (a form being filled in).
2.MS of a nurse looking off-screen up and left writing at the typewriter and asking questions (of a patient who is not seen, but who happens to be Lauko).

3.ECU of the doctor's small mirror (for mouth and throat observation) being heated over a flame. The doctor's voice off is heard.
4.CU of doctor. PAN/TRACK right (back of Lauko's head, completely out of focus, is seen in the foreground).
5.LS of Lauko by the door looking off-screen right. He asks what is wrong with him and the doctor tells him that they will have to wait for the test results. Lauko opens the door and leaves the room.
6.LS of doctor looking off-screen right. The nurse's voice can be heard asking for the diagnosis. He tells her but also gives her some details of Lauko's private life (which he cannot possibly know since he does not know Lauko): he is a lonely person and so on.
7.LS of a photograph of Lauko. He is naked against a wall.
8.LS of the same photograph (now the head is off frame). TILT up to reveal the head.

Shots 1 to 5 of the scene convey Lauko's subjectivity: eye matches between shots 2 to 5 (with a bit of cheating in shot 1 since only the nurse can see the form at that distance). The absence of the ES in this scene also conveys the isolation of Lauko from his doctors and illness. The isolation is emphazised when he leaves the room. The doctor has not told him what is wrong with him. Shot 6 is objective but in a strange way since the doctor is saying things that, first, have nothing to do with his job and Lauko's illness and secondly, things that he cannot possibly know. Furthermore shots 7 and 8 are not in the doctor's room. They are a-spatial and a-temporal. They could be images in the mind of the doctor but they convey to the spectator (only, not to any character) the vulnerability, fragility of Lauko before his illness (and during his whole passive life). Again someone unknown is observing Lauko. None the less the subjectivity of Lauko's narration is the strongest element in the film. There is one scene with no ES in a restaurant where, apart from a few shots on Lauko, all the rest are POV shots from Lauko. Throughout the film all the scenes in which Lauko takes part, whether containing an ES or not, contain a significant number of POV shots from Lauko.

The ex-wife's narrative line is shot and edited more 'conventionally', more objectively, always using the ES. One can conclude, then, that there are two narrations in 322 , an objective one (that of the ex-wife) and a subjective one (that of Lauko).

The fact that two narrations exist in the film questions the nature narrative and whether one can trust narrative as a means of discovering reality. The objectivity and subjectivity of a narration is further questioned in a scene in the hospital where Lauko enters his ward for the first time. The scene opens with a hand held POV shot of Lauko's fellow patients in the ward, each in his bed. Later (still with no ES of the room) a friend of Lauko (a Gypsy who has his ID painted in the back of his jacket – an image which supports the themes of isolation, a Gypsy being an outcast from society) enters the room. He takes the glasses of one the patients and puts them on. These glasses have pebble lenses. With these glassess which impede his vision the Gypsy moves around the whole room with the camera following him. This makes for the ES of the room (which is not Lauko's subjective shot since he is seen in it). The spectator is introduced to the whole room by a person who is 'blind', that is, who cannot see the room that he is showing the spectator. The question is whether the spectator should trust or rather question a blind guide. Perhaps a narration prevents the perceiver from seeing reality much in the way that the pebble lenses prevent the Gypsy from seeing the room.

Another scene, shot as documentary footage following Cinéma-Verité aesthetics, shows images of the streets of Bratislava. The authenticity of the images is questioned when a voice coming from loudspeakers tells the passers-by what to do and what not to do (don't cross the street; cross now; don't smoke in the street, and so on). The passers-by react to the commands. That is, the footage shows that the realist, authentic image can be easily manipulated and what seems real might not be so. This scene questions Cinéma-Verité, but also the objectivity of a narration. As has been the case with so many of New Wave films, it seems to question whether there is such a thing as an objective narration. The spectator is told from the opening credit titles to question what he/she is about to watch and to consider the subjective nature of narrative and of reality. The film opens with a sentence written in black letters over a white background which states that 'události a motivy filmu sú vymyšlene a nezhodujú sa so skutečnosťou' (the events and motifs of the film are invented and do not coincide with reality). This sentence at the beginning of the film puts any spectator on guard. The sentence stresses the fictitious nature of narrative but at the same time the film is shot in accordance with an aesthetic which intends to be as realist as possible. Furthermore, the average spectator knows that a film is fiction so will ask why the director is warning the spectator of what he/she already knows. A second

sentence follows after the title of the film, as a subtitle. The sentence, this time written in white letters on a black background, says: 'zo života človeka, ktorý ztratil vieru a neodvažuje sa neveriť.' (from the life of a person who lost faith and does not dare not to believe). The sentence seems to contradict the previous sentence, since it is suggesting the film is based on the life of a real person. Which sentence should the spectator follow? The spectator already has to choose, to question. This second sentence could be understood as the need that people have to believe in something, in this case the spectator needs to believe what he is watching (but the film is telling him/her not to). Again, the question is to what extent does one discover reality by means of a narrative medium such as film (which provides an apparent objective rendering of reality). Finally, two thirds into the film, a third sentence appears: 'keď na niečo nemyslíš tak to nie je.' (if you don't think about something it does not exist) This sentence recalls the POV shot in Solan's Boxer a smrt where the chimney is concealed by the tree: what you do not see does not exist. It refers to Lauko's cancer, but it also refers to the subjective nature of reality. Something exists only when it is thought about. Likewise one could argue that reality, or its essence, only exists when it is narrated, when it is mediatized, discovered, by narration.

The writer/director who questioned narrative to a degree that became a vicious circle, who played most with narrative in Slovak cinema is Robbe-Grillet. The nouveau roman which influenced young Slovak writers of the late 1950s and early 1960s and the young Slovak film directors of the late 1960s, is brought physically to Slovakia by Robbe-Grillet with Muž ktorý luže (The man who lies, 1968). In this film the subjectivity and the uncertainty of a narration are borne, both verbally and visually in the actual words of the narrator, heard in voice-off and/or spoken by the main character (it is the same voice but the question remains whether it is actually the same narrator) and in the images which might or might not contradict what is being heard. The editing of the film with many scenes lacking an ES contributes to the subjectivity and the subsequent uncertainty of the narrative. Thus the man who is lying is the narrator, who might or might not be the main character, who is also lying. The man who lies is also the camera and the editing. With so many narrative elements lying can the spectator believe the narrative or should he/she distrust it?

The opening scene with the credit titles has no ES. The main character is seen running through a forest. These are hand held camera shots running behind the man. These shots are interwoven and juxtaposed with shots of German soldiers beating the

undergrowth in the forest. Gun shots are heard in the frames showing the man who is running, followed by (film) shots were the German soldiers are shooting. Hand grenades explode all over the man in one shot. In the next grenades are thrown by the soldiers. In one shot the man is seen falling. He has been hit, and killed. Then the lighting in the shot changes dramatically, from night to day. The man then stands up as if nothing had happened (has he faked his own death to trick the German soldiers?). At no point are the German soldiers and the man seen together in one shot, which questions whether the hunt has taken place. It is the background of the forest, among other visual and aural elements of causal continuity, that creates the spatial unity.

It is day now. The chase seems to have ceased (why have the German soldier not approached the 'corpse' or taken it away?). The spectator sees the man wandering in pastoral calm through the forest, and at the same time the spectator hears some steps which take place in the interior of a room. This brings about a contradiction in what he/she is watching. This is followed by the Ich-narrator's voice-off: 'My name is Jan Robin. I'll tell you my story.....or I'll try...or rather not (vlastne nie).' A series of flash-inserts of women takes place, returning later to shots of the man in the forest. The narrator continues: 'Where was I? Ah, yes. My name is Boris Varissa.' When the narrator says the name inserts of photographs of a man (different from that in the forest) are shown. The narrator says: 'Who was Jan? My friend, my comrade.' The Ich-narrator becomes an Er-narrator.

Only five minutes into the film and the spectator already has to decide whether the chase has taken place; whether the man has been shot or he was pretending; whether the narrator is the same man as the one in the forest; whether the narrator (and the man in the forest) is Ján Robín (a Slovak) or Boris Varissa (a Ukrainian). The former might or might not be the man shown in the photographs or the man in the forest. In the next scene the spectator will have to decide the time when the visual narration is taking place. If the narrator is narrating past events in the present, then the images should be illustrating that past, since they belong to the voice's narration. But what the voice is narrating verbally contradicts what is occurring visually. The narrator says: 'the streets were full of German check-points and patrols.' But in the images the man seen in the forest (lets refer to him by the actor's name which is probably the only certain element in this film, Jean-Louis Trintignant) walks through deserted streets. Furthermore, the voice's narration says that the first thing he (referring to himself) did when he arrived in the town was to go to the local pub which

he claims was empty. But Trintignant entersa pub, in full ES, full of regulars. Each of themhas some comment about Ján Robin. One of them hopes that one day somebody will explain to him what had happened to Ján Robín. Others claim that he will never return . All this is shown in CUs of the customers each of them looking straight into the camera (at the spectator? At the narrator?). None of the pub's customers seems to notice the presence of Trintignant, or even recognize him; he might or might not be Ján Robín. Trintignant speaks in CU to the camera and asks: 'Poznate Jána Robína?' (Do you know Ján Robín ?). He himself answers: 'He is dead.' Again, the question might be directed to the spectator, or perhaps to the customers; looking straight into the camera might be an eye-match on the axis of the previous series of CU shots of the customers. But in the ES none of this eye-matching would be possible since Trintignant has his back to the rest of the customers.

The confusion of the narrative is stressed with sequences playing with film time and film space which show 'false' eye-matches across times and spaces of the narrative. Some of the shots in these sequences refer to scenes which have taken place already or will take place later.

There are three woman in the narrative (actually four if one includes the waitress in the pub). One is the maid who works at Robín's house, but who started working after he left for the war and therefore has not met him (although she has heard a lot about him) and would not recognise him if she did. Another is Robín's sister. The third is Robín's cousin and wife (although it is not clear whether they were only about to marry when the war broke out, and so she might his betrothed rather than wife). Trintignant meets all of them together in one scene but not in an ES. Only one of them is established spatially in one shot with him in this scene, the sister, with whom he would (probably) have an affair. The other two are established by means of eye-matches. Trintignant tells them, the sister in particular, that Jan has sent him, that his name is Boris Varissa. Trintignant says that they have already met him but that he has changed, that they do not recognise him because before he was in disguise wearing glasses and a false beard. Again the narrative is questioning itself, one fact hides behind another fact, a lie uncovers a truth, and vice versa. This scene also continues to reflect upon the question of identity; that is, Trintignant was wearing a mask (glasses, beard), the tool which the actors wore in Ancient Greece and Rome, which medicine men (who are the bearers of all the myths of the tribe) wore and so on. In other words, fiction and reality overlap.

At some point in the narrative the man seen in the photographs at the beginning, who is supposed to be Ján Robín, and Trintignant, who is supposed to be Boris Varissa, are seen together. Trintignant tells 'Robín': 'we have to trust each other'. Trintignant seems to be addressing the statement/command not only to Robín but also to the spectator: I am an actor who is conveying this narrative by means of the character of the film. At the same time the film tells the spectator not to trust Trintignant, not to trust anything. In the course of the film the man on the photograph and Trintignant continuously exchange identities.

Another wink of complicity at the spectator takes place when Jan (let us assume for the sake of argument if only for the time being that the man in the photograph is Jan) is walking in the forest. The shot is a hand held camera shot which denotes subjectivity, that is, a POV shot, probably from Trintignant. But suddenly Trintignant appears on the left hand corner making the shot an objective one or rather a POV shot from the narrator or even the spectator.

Gradually in the course of the film a barely essential plot is revealed. Boris Varissa and Ján Robín were both partisans during the war. One of them was captured by the Germans, betrayed by the other. Or one was captured and betrayed the other to save himself. At the end of the war one of them is looking for the other in order to take revenge. This is as far the spectator can get since every time something is said or seen, every time any factual information about the narrative is given, it is immediately contradicted either verbally or visually or both. At one point Trintignant tells the maid who has never seen Ján Robín that she must know the truth (that she must get to know the truth - 'musíte znať pravdu'). But the question posed by the narrative is what truth, what reality , in particular, what is reality when perceived through a medium, by means of a narrative. At the end of the film nobody believes Trintignant, not even himself. His narration is questioned by himself. Images of Trintignant watching himself (that is, juxtaposed shots with no ES where in one shot Trintignant's off-screen gaze is matched in the next shot by an off-screen gaze of the same Trintignant) confronts subjectivity/narration with his own subjectivity/narration. Again Trintignant tells the maid that she can doubt whether the sun shines, but that she must not doubt that he loves her. That is, he is telling her that she should not doubt what he is telling her, she should not doubt his narration.

The game carried out by Robbe-Grillet is taken further with a metafictional wink. Trintignant, the character, tells Robín's wife or betrothed that he is an actor and

he has been acting all along. This statement is true regarding Trintignant the real actor, but uncertain regarding the character in the film. The joke is that perhaps even Trintignant the real actor is lying, which is true since he is actor. And so on.

Needless to say none of the questions posed by Robbe-Grillet's narrative and directed to the spectator has an answer. All the narrative lines, all the answers to all the questions are narratively plausible and even simultaneous without cancelling each other out. When Trintignant says he is Ján Robín, he is Ján Robín. And when he says that he is Boris Varissa, he is Boris Varissa. And he is Robín and Varissa simultaneously (a simultaneity which recalls that of Borges's stories in Ficciones , in particular El jardin de los senderos que se bifurcan). There is only one certainty in narrative. Narrative is a game: everything is unreal, everything is real. It is up to the perceiver to decide what is what based upon certain rules which are accepted by both author and perceiver, but rules that can be broken. From the point of view of the perceiver narration is a subjective phenomenon in that the perceiver has to choose whether to trust that narrative or not, and experience the narrative on the basis of his/her decision. Based on this, reality might also be a subjective phenomenon in that the perceiver has to choose what he/she wants to perceive.

CONCLUSION

In this thesis I have attempted to reveal the aetiology of the absence of the establishing shot in the editing style of the Czechoslovak New Wave. The first point my thesis demonstrates is that the Czechoslovak New Wave had a unique way of editing that differentiated it from those other so-called new cinemas, which were also questioning the continuity style. Never in the history of sound cinema had so many films been edited with such a large number of scenes that lacked the establishing shot. Having ascertained this absence one had to ask oneself why it was the young Czech and Slovak directors who employed this non-ES technique and not, for example, the Polish or Hungarian, or French directors all of whom were just as interested as the Czechoslovaks in experimenting with film form. It is perhaps no coincidence that, to use the novelist Josef Škvorecký's phrase, 'all those bright young men and women' of the New Wave who developed the non-ES technique had studied at FAMU and had attended the lectures on montage theory given by Jan Kučera. Kučera's approach to film theory, influenced by the writings of the leading Structuralist Mukařovský, was not prescriptive; as a theorist he was no inflexible defender of the application of a conventional set of norms, but on the contrary, a theorist who encouraged the breaking of the norms, who encouraged experimenting with the medium in order to find new aesthetic possibilities. Kučera's theory of montage is centred on the analysis of spatial continuity and he is one of the few theorists of montage who specifically rejects the need of the establishing shot for the creation of spatial continuity.The second point at the heart of my thesis concerns the reason the Czechoslovak New Wave did not employ the establishing shot. I have endeavoured to answer that by looking at the purpose of the non-ES technique, that is, at what the directors were trying to convey by developing this technique. There seems to be little doubt that the New Wave directors were reacting against Socialist Realist aesthetics and the conception of the collective forced upon the society in which the directors were living. This reaction consisted in the portrayal of the isolated and individualized characters , and in the conveyance of a subjective narration as a means of questioning reality. The non-ES technique provided the technical means of conveying this individualization of characters, the subjectivity of narrative, and the questioning of reality in much the same way as Czech and Slovak writers of the late 1950s and the 1960s used the first-

person (Ich) narrators. The Slovak New Wave directors, under the influence of the nouveau roman, went further and not only questioned reality but narrative itself as a means to discover and question reality. In other words they questioned the validity of film narrative and its capacity to reveal reality.

Overall, this thesis has, I hope, provided a tool for the better understanding of film space and, in particular, of how film space is created and how spatial continuity is perceived by the spectator. Part II has discussed aspects of film theory that appear to be behind the non-ES technique of the New Wave. I have, however, found more interesting to see how does the Czechoslovak New Wave might reinterpret those theories of montage that have attempted to reveal the functioning of spatial continuity in an edited film sequence. The New Wave serves to illustrate theories of montage that have been either ignored or misinterpreted in the West. All the theories of montage discussed in Part II share a central idea, that of semantic completion. Each of the theories approaches the idea from a different angle: Kuleshov and Pudovkin place the emphasis on the notion of constructive editing and on the fact that each shot should contain some element which refers to the subsequent shot. Balázs's approach starts from the premise that the perception of the shots by the spectator is temporal. Eisenstein's main contribution is the principle of juxtaposition and how this process of juxtaposition takes place in the consciousness of the spectator. Mukařovský takes an 'epistemological' and Structuralist approach to film reaching conclusions similar to those of Balázs, that is, the temporal nature of film space. Kučera synthesises the ideas of Pudovkin, Kuleshov, Balázs, Eisenstein, and Mukařovský and develops them into a view whereby a succession of constituent elements which, within each shot, create questions and answers that allow the spectator to refer them to preceding and subsequent shots. All the theorists discussed in Part II agree on one major point. The spectator is not a passive observer but an active co-participant in understanding the logic of the images he/she is faced with. In the end, it is the logic of the images that ultimately creates spatial continuity and not the establishing shot.

Finally, illustrating the theories of montage by means of the New Wave, and supporting the New Wave's non-ES technique with the theories of montage has led me to a reinterpretation of the relationship between film theory and film practice. Jan Kučera and the directors of the Czechoslovak New Wave demonstrate that this relationship should be one of continuous dialogue.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andrew, J. Dudley. The Major Film Theories, Oxford, London, NewYork, OUP, 1976.

- Concepts in Film Theory, Oxford, OUP, 1984.

Alberti, Leon Batista. On Painting, London, Penguin,1991.

Arijon, Daniel. Grammar of the Film Language, Beverly Hills, CA, Silman James, 1976.

Armes, Roy. The Cinema of Alain Resnais, Amsterdam, Zwemmer,1968.

Arnheim, Rudolf. Film as Art, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, University of California Press, 1957.

- 'Melancholy Unshaped', Towards a Psychology of Art, Collected Essays, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1966.

- Art and Visual Perception, London, Faber and Faber, 1967.

Ash, Mitchell G.. Gestalt Psychology in German Culture, 1890-1967, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Balázs, Béla. Theory of Film, translated by Edith Bone, London, Dobson, 1952.

Birnbaum, Henrik and Thomas Eekman (eds). Fiction and Drama in Eastern and Southeastern Europe, Los Angeles, 1980.

Booth, Wayne C. The Rhetoric of Fiction, Chicago, Chicago University Press, 1961.

Bordwell, David. Narration in the Fiction Film, London, Routledge, 1985.

- On the History of Film Style, Cambridge, Mass, Harvard 1997.

Bordwell, David, Janet Staiger, and Kristin Thompson. The Classical Hollywood Cinema, New York, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985.

Branigan, Edward. Narrative Comprehension and Film, London, 1992.

Brušák, Karel. 'Znaky na čínském divadle', in Slovo a slovesnost, 1938, pp. 91-98.

Buchar, Robert. Czech New Wave Filmmakers in Interviews, North Carolina, London, 2004.

Burch, Noël. To the Distant Observer, London, Scolar Press,1971.

- Theory of Practice, London, Secker and Warburg, 1973.

- Life to Those Shadows, London, BFI, 1990.

Casetti, Francesco. Teorias del cine, Madrid, Catedra,1994.

Chatman, Seymour. Story and Discourse, Ithaca, and London, Cornell University Press, 1978.

Cicero. De Inventione, translated by H.M. Hubbell, Cambridge, MA, and London, Harvard University Press, 1949.

Clark, Katerina. The Soviet Novel. History as Ritual, 3rd edn, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2000.

Crittenden, Roger. Film and Video Editing, 2nd edn, London, Routledge, 2000.

Dancyger, Ken. The Technique of Film and Video Editing, 2nd edn, Boston, Focal Press, 1997.

Devětsil. Sborník, I, Prague, 1922.

Dmytryk, Edward. On Film Editing, Boston, Focal Press, 1985.

Doležal, Lubomír. Narrative Modes in Czech Literature, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1973.

Elsaesser, Thomas (ed). Early Cinema: Space, Frame, Narrative, London, BFI, 1990.

S.M. Eisenstein. Film Form, Translated by Jay Leyda, San Diego, New York, London, Harcourt Brace,1949.

- Notes of a Film Director, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House,1958.

- Film Essays and a Lecture, translated by Jay Leyda, New York, Praeger,1970.

- Nonindifferent Nature, translated by Herbert Marshall, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press,1987.

- Paměti, translated by Olga and Jaroslav Žákovi, Prague, Odeon,1987.

- Selected Works, I, Writings 1922-34, Translated by Richard Taylor, London, BFI, 1988.

- Selected Works, II, Towards a Theory of Montage, Translated by Michael Glenny, London, BFI, 1994.

Fairservice, Don. Film Editing. History, Theory, and Practice, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2001.

Forman, Miloš. Co já vím?, Brno, Atlantis, 1994.

Film a doba, 1954-1970.

Filmový sborník historický, 4, Prague, Narodni Filmový Archiv, 1993.

French, A. The Poets of Prague, London, OUP, 1969.

- Czech Writers and Politics in 1945-1964, Canberra, Australian National University Press, 1982.

Fuks, Ladislav, Pan Theodor Mundstock, Prague, Československý spisovatel, 1963.

Garvin, Paul L. (ed). A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Washington, Georgetown

University Press, 1964.

Gautier, Théophile. Mademoiselle de Maupin, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1981.

Gombrich, E.H. . The Story of Art, 11th edn, London, Phaidon,1966.

- Art and Illusion, 5th edn, London, Phaidon, 1977.

- The Sense of Order, 2nd edn, London, Phaidon, 1984.

- Norm and Form, 4th edn, Phaidon, 1985.

Hall, James. A History of Ideas and Images in Italian Art, New York, Harper and Row, 1983.

Hames, Peter. The Czechoslovak New Wave, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, University of California Press, 1985.

Happé, Bernard. Basic Motion Picture Technology, 2nd edn, London, Focal Press, 1975.

Haraszti, Miklos. The Velvet Prison, London, Penguin, 1989.

Harkins, William E. and Paul I. Trensky (eds). Czech Literature since 1956: A Symposium, New York, Bohemica, 1980.

Hodrová, Daniela. Na okraji chaosu...Poetika literárního díla 20. století, Prague, Torst, 2001.

Hrabal, Bohumil. Pábitelé, Prague, Mladá Fronta, 1964.

Huaco, George A. The Sociology of Film Art, New York and London, 1965.

Iluminace, 8, 1, Prague, Narodni Filmový Archiv, 1996.

Iser, Wolfang. The Implied Reader, Baltimore, London, John Hopkins University Press, 1974.

- The Act of Reading, Baltimore, London, John Hopkins University Press,1978.

Jacob, Lewis. The Rise of American Film, New York, 1939.

Jakobson, Roman. 'Úpadek filmu?', Film a doba, 1989, 2, pp84-86.

Jauss, Hans Robert. Towards an Aesthetic of Reception, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press,1982.

Johanides, Ján. Súkromie, Bratislava, 1971.

- Podstata kamenolomu, Bratislava, Slovenský spisovatelí1965.

- Nie, Bratislava, 1966.

Juraček, Pavel. Deník, 1957-1974, Prague, Narodní Filmový Archiv, 2003.

Kafka, Franz. The Castle, translated by Willa and Edwin Muir, with additional material translated by Eithne Wilkins and Ernst Kaiser, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1957.

- The Trial, translated by Willa and Edwin Muir, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1953.

- Metamorphosis and Other Stories, translated by Willa and Edwin Muir, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1961.
- America, translated by Willa and Edwin Muir, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1967.
Kepley jr, Vance. 'The Kuleshov Workshop', Iris, 4, 1, 1986, pp. 5-24.
Kracauer, Sigfried. Theory of Film. The Redemption of Physical Reality, NewYork, OUP, 1965.
Kučera, Jan. Kniha o filmu, Prague, Orbis, 1941.
- Základy filmové skladby, Prague, 1948-49.
- Zásady vnitrní skladby filmového obrazu, Prague, 1950.
- Filmová interpunkce, Prague, 1950.
- Střihová skladba I, Prague, 1959.
- Skladba ve filmu a televizi, Prague, SPN, 1964.
Kuleshov, Lev. Kuleshov on Film, Berkeley, University of California Press,1974.
Kundera, Milan. The Art of the Novel, London, Faber and Faber, 1990.
Lawson, J. H. Film: the Creative Process, New York, Hill and Wang,1964.
Lessing , G.E.. Laocoön, Baltimore, London, Johns Hopkins,1984.
Leutrat, Jean Loius. L'Année dernière à Marienbad, London, BFI, 2000.
Levaco, Ronald. 'Kuleshov', Sight and Sound, 40, 2, 1971, pp. 86-91 and 109.
Leyda, Jay. Kino, London, George Allen and Unwin, 1960.
Liehm, Antonin J. Closely Watched Films, New York, International Arts and Sciences Press, 1974.
- Příběhy Miloše Formana, Prague, Mladá Fronta, 1993.
Liehm, Mira, and Antonin J. Liehm. The Most Important Art: Eastern European Film After 1945. Translated by Káča Poláčková-Henley. Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press,1977.
Lindgren, E. The Art of the Film, London, George Allen and Unwin, 1948.
di Lino, Micciche. 'Una generazione senza monumenti nel nuovo cinema Cecoslovaco', Bianco e nero, 1965, 9, pp. 1-55.
Macek, Václav. Dušan Hanák, Bratislava, FOTOFO, Slovenský filmový ústav, VSMU, 1996.
- Stefan Uher, Bratislava, Slovenský filmový ústav, 2002.
Macek, Václav and Jelena Pasteková. Dejiny slovenskej kinematografie, Bratislava, Osveta, 1997.
Matejka, Ladislav. Sound, Sign, and Meaning, Michigan, 1978.
Mitry, Jean. Esthétique et psychologie du cinema. 1. Les structures, Paris, Editions

universities, 1963.

- Esthétique et psychologie du cinema. 2. Les formes, Paris, Editions universities, 1963.

Mukařovský, Jan. Studie z estetiky, Prague, Odeon, 1966.

- Selected Essays. Structure, Sign and Function. New Haven, London, Yale University Press, 1977.

Nemes, Karoly. Films of Commitment, Budapest, Corvina, 1985.

Nizhny, Vladimir. Lessons with Eisenstein, London, George Allen and Unwin,1962.

Paral, Vladimír. Soukromá vichřice, Prague, Mladá fronta, 1966.

Petric, Vlada. Constructivism in Film, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press,1987.

Plazewski, Jerzy. Filmová řeč, Prague, Orbis,1967 (originally published as Jezyk filmu, Warsaw, 1961).

Pliny. Natural History, Books 33-35, translated by H. Rackman, Cambridge, MA, and London, Harvard University Press, 1952.

Prádná, Stanislava, Zdena Skapová, and Jirí Cieslar. Démanty všednosti, Prague, Prazská scéna, 2002.

Ptácek, Lubos (ed). Panorama českého filmu, Olomouc, Rubico, 2000.

Pudovkin, V.I. Film Technique, London, George Newnes,1933.

Pynsent, Robert B. and S.I. Kanikova (eds). The Everyman Companion To East European Literature, London, Everyman, 1993.

Pynsent, Robert (ed). Modern Slovak Prose, Fiction Since 1954, London, Macmillan, 1990.

- Sex Under Socialism, London, SSEES,1994.

Reisz, Karel, and Gavin Millar. The Technique of Film Editing, 2nd edn, London, Focal Press, 1968.

Romm, Michail. 'Poznámky o montázi', Film a doba, 1959, 10, pp. 662-69 and 11, pp.724-31.

Salinger, J.D. The Catcher in the Rye, Harmondsworth, Penguin,1951.

Salt, Barry. Film Style and Technology: History and Analysis, London, Starword, 1983.

Sanchez-Biosca, Vicente. El montaje cinematográfico, Barcelona, Paidos, 1995.

Sight and Sound, 1960s.

Sillitoe, Alan. Saturday Night and Sunday Morning, London, Flamingo,1958.

- The Loneliness of the Long Distance Runner, London, W.H. Allen, 1959.

Sirový, Zdeněk. ...není zač, řekl Bůh, Prague, Český spisovatel, 1996.

Škvorecký, Josef. Zbabělci, Prague, Český spisovatel, 1958.
- Všichni ti bystří mladí muži a ženy, Prague, Horizont, 1991.
Soviet Socialist Realism in Literature and Art, Moscow, 1971.
Spottiswoode, Raymond. A Grammar of the Film, London, Faber and Faber,1935.
Staenzel, F.K. A Theory of Narrative, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1984.
Styblová, Valja. Mne soudila noc, Prague, Československý spisovatel, 1958.
Svitáček, Vladimir. 'K otázce orientace diváka ve filmovém prostoru', Film a doba, 1954, 6, pp. 1048-57.
Svitak, Ivan. Film in the Manipulated World, Chico, CA, 1977.
- The Czechoslovak Experiment, New York, Chicago University Press,1971.
Svoboda, Ján, 'Problém casu a prostoru v filmovém umení', Film a doba, 37, 3, 1991, pp. 182-3.
Taylor, Richard (ed), The Poetics of Cinema, in Russian Poetics in Translation, 9, 1982.
Taylor, Richard, Nancy Wood, Julian Graffy, and Dina Iordanova (eds). The BFI Companion to Eastern European and Russian Cinema, London, BFI, 2000.
Teige,Karel, Film, Prague, Nakladatelství Václava Petra, 1925.
- 'K estetice filmu', Studio 1929, Prague, 1929, pp. 166-71, 193-97, 231-35, 262-66, 289-93.
Tsivian, Yuri, Ekaterina Khokhlova and Kristin Thompson. 'The Rediscovery of a Kuleshov Experiment', Film History, 8, 1996, pp.357-64.
Tsivian, Yuri. Early Cinema in Russia and its Cultural Reception, Chicago, London, 1998.
Turigliatto, Roberto (ed). Nová vlna, Cinema cecoslovaco degli anni '60, Torino, Lindau, 1995.
Vaculík, Ludvik. Sekyra, Prague, Československý spisovatel, 1966.
Vachek, Josef, (comp.). A Prague School Reader in Linguistics, Bloomington, NY, Indiana University Press, 1964.
- The Linguistic School of Prague, Bloomington, London, Indiana University Press, 1966.
Vaughan, James. Soviet Socialist Realism, Macmillan, 1973.
Vávra, Otakar. Zamyšlení režiséra, Prague, Prostor knizní klub, 1982.
- Podivný život režiséra, Prague, Panorama,1997.
Vertov, Dziga. Kino-eye, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1984.
Wellek, Rene. Essays in Czech Literature, Hague, Mouton, 1963.

- Concepts of Criticism, New Haven, London, Yale Univerity Press, 1963.

- 'Russian Formalism', in Gibian, George and H.W. Tsalma (eds), Russian Modernism, Culture and the Avant-garde, 1910-30, Ithaca, London, 1979.

Woll, Josephine. Real Images, Soviet Cinema and the Thaw, London, New York, I.B. Tauris, 200.

Zalman, Ján. Umlcený film, Prague, Narodni Filmový Archiv, 1993.

Zich, Otakar, Estetika dramatického umení, Prague, 1931.

Zsuffa, Joseph, Béla Balázs, The Man and the Artist, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, University of California Press, 1987.

FILMOGRAPHY

Alexandrov, Grigori V. Svetlyi put' ,1940.

Bočan, Hynek. Nikdo se nebude smát, (Nobody will laugh),1965.

- Soukromá vichrice, 1967.
- Čest a sláva, 1969.
- Past'ák, 1970/1990.

Bondarchuk, Sergei F. Sud'ba cheloveka, 1959.

Brynych, Zbyněk, Jerzy Skolimowski and Peter Solan, Dialog 20, 40, 60, 1968.

Brynych, Zbyněk. Transport z ráje, 1963.

- ...a pátý jezdec je Strach, 1964.

Čáp, František. Muži bez křídel, 1946.

Cassavettes, John. Shadows, 1959.

- Faces, 1969.

Chytilová, Věra. U stropu je pytel blech, (There's a bag of fleas on the ceiling),1963.

- Sedmikrásky, (Daisies),1966.
- Ovoce stromů rajských jime, 1969.

Chytilová, Věra, Jaromil Jireš, Jiří Menzel, Jan Němec, and Evald Schorm. Perličky na dně, (Pearls at the bottom)1965.

Cikán, Miroslav. O sevci Matousovi, 1948.

- Výstrata, 1953.

Clayton, Jack. Room at the Top, 1958.

Deren, Maya. Meshes of the Afternoon, 1943.

- At Land, 1944.
- A Study in Choreography for the Camera, 1945.
- Ritual In Transfigured Time, 1946.
- Meditation in Violence, 1948.
- Haiti, 1947-51.
- The Very Eye of Night, 1959.

Dovzhenko, Alexander. Zvenigora, 1935.

- Zemlya, 1930.
- Aerograd, 1935.

Dreyer, Carl Theodor. La passion de Jeanne d'Arc, 1928.

Eisenstein, Sergei M. Stachka, 1925.

- Bronesonets Potëmkin, 1926.
- Oktyabr' 1928.

- Staroe i novoe, 1929.
- Bezhin lug, 1935.
- Alexandr Nevskii, 1938.
- Ivan Groznyi, 1943-46.
Forman, Miloš. Konkurs, (Competition),1963.
- Černý Petr, (Black Peter),1963.
- Lásky jedné plavovlásky, (Loves of a Blonde),1965.
- Hoří, má panenko, 1967.
- Taking Off, 1971.
Gajer, Václav. Úsmevavá zem, 1951.
- Ročník 21, 1957.
Godard, Jean Luc. A bout de souffle, 1959.
- Vivre sa vie, 1962.
- Le mephris, 1963.
Hanák, Dušan. 322, 1969.
- Obrazy starého sveta, 1972.
- Ružové sny, 1976.
- Ja milujem, ty miluješ, 1980.
Has, Wojciech Jerzy. Petla, 1958.
Havetta, Elo. Slavnosť v botanickej zahrade, 1969.
- L'alie pol'ne, 1972.
Helge, Ladislav. Škola otců, 1957.
- Velká samota, 1959.
Herz, Juraj. Sberné surovosti, 1965.
- Spalovač mrtvol, 1968.
Hubáček, Miroslav. Kavárna na hlavní tříde, 1953.
Jakubisko, Juraj. Mlčanie, 1963.
- Dážď', 1965.
- Čakanie na Godota, 1966.
- Kristové roky, 1967.
- Zbehovia a pútnici, 1968.
- Vtáčkovia, siroty a blázni, 1969.
Jancsó, Miklós. Szegénylegények, 1965.
- Csillagosok, katonák, 1967.
- Fényes szelek, 1968.
Jasný, Vojtěch and Karel Kachyňa. Dnes večer všechno skončí, 1954.

Jasný, Vojtěch. Zárijové noci, 1957.
- Touha, 1958.
- Prežil jsem svou smrt, 1960.
- Procesí k pannence, 1961.
- Až přijde kocour, 1963.
- Dýmky, 1966.
- Všichni dobří rodáci, 1968.
Jireš, Jaromil. Křik, (The cry),1963.
- Žert, (The Joke),1968.
- Valerie a tyden divu, (Valerie and her week of wonders),1970.
Juraček, Pavel. Kazdý mladý muž, (Every young man),1965.
- Případ pro začínajícího kata, 1969.
Kachyňa, Karel. Kral Sumavy, 1959.
- At' žije republika, 1965.
- Kočár do Vídne, 1966.
- Ucho, 1970.
Kozintsev, Grigori M. and Leonid Trauberg. Novyi Vavilon, 1929.
Krejčík, Jiří. Svedomí, 1948.
- Probuzení, 1959.
- Vyšší princip, 1961.
Krška, Václav. Revoluční rok 1848, 1949.
- Mikulaš Ales, 1951.
- Mesic nad řekou, 1953.
- Cesta zpátky, 1958.
- Zde jsou lvi, 1959.
Kuleshov, Lev V. Neobychainye priklyucheniya Mistera Vesta v strane bol'shevikov, 1924.
- Po zakonu, 1926.
- Velikii uteshitel', 1933.
Loach, Ken. Poor Cow, 1967.
- Kes, 1970.
Mach, Josef. Vzbouření na vsi, 1948.
- Racek má zpozdení, 1950.
- Akce B, 1951.
- Florenc 13:30, 1957.
Makavejev, Dusan. Čovek nije tica, 1965.

- Ljubavni slučaj ili tragedija službenice PTT, 1967.
- Nevinost bez zaštite, 1968.
- W.R. - Misterije organizma, 1971.

Makovec, Miloš. Případ Dr. Kováře, 1949.

Menzel, Jiří. Zločin v divci škole, 1965.
- Ostre sledované vlaky, (Closely observed/watched trains),1966.
- Rozmarné leto, 1967.
- Zločin v šantánu, 1968.
- Skrivánci na niti, 1969.

Mikhalkov-Konchalovsky, Andron S. Pervyi uchitel', 1965.

Munk, Andrzej. Eroica, 1958.
- Pasazerka, 1961.

Muratova, Kira G. Korotkie vstrechi, 1967.
- Dolgie provody, 1971.

Myzet, Rudolf. Písnička za groš, 1952.

Němec, Jan. Sousto, 1962.
- Demanty noci, 1964.
- O slavnosti a hostech, (About the party and the guests),1966.
- Mučednici lásky, (Martyrs of love), 1967.

Novak, Ivo. Štěnata, (Puppies),1957.

Passer, Ivan. Intimní osvětlení, (Intimate lighting),1965.

Polanski, Roman. Dwaj Ludzie z szafa, 1958.
- Noz w wodzie, 1962.

Pudovkin, Vsevolod I. Mat', 1926.
- Konets Sankt-Peterburga, 1927.
- Potomok Chingis-khana, 1928.

Radványi, Géza. Valahol Európában, 1947.

Raizman, Yuli Ya. A esli eto lyubov'?, 1962.

Ray, Nicholas. Rebel Without a Cause, 1955.

Resnais, Alain. Hiroshima mon amour, 1959.
- L'Anné dernière a Marienbad, 1961.
- La Guerre est finie, 1966.

Reisz, Karel. Saturday Night, Sunday Morning, 1960.

Richardson, Tony. A Taste of Honey, 1961.
- The Loneliness of the Long Distance Runner, 1962.

Romm, Mikhail I. Pyshka, 1934.

Savchenko, Igor A. Garmon' , 1934.

Sequens, Jiří. Cesta k štestí, 1951.

- Neporažení, 1956.

Schlesinger, John. A Kind of Loving, 1962.

Schorm, Evald. Kazdy den odvahu, (Every day's courage),1964.

- Navrat ztraceného syna, (Return of the prodigal son), 1966.

- Pet holek na krku, (Saddled with five girls),1967.

- Den sedmý, osmá noc, 1969.

- O pséch a lidéch, 1970.

Solan, Peter. Boxer a smrt, (The boxer and death)1962.

- Tvar v okne, (Face in the window),1963.

- Prípad Barnabaš Kos, (The case of Barnabas Kos),1964.

- Kým sa skončí tato noc, 1965.

- Pan si neželal nič, 1970.

Steklý, Karel. Siréna, 1947.

- Anna proletářská, 1952.

Szabó, István.Szerelmesfilm, 1970.

Truffaut, François. Les quatre cents coups, 1959.

- Tirez sur le pianiste , 1960.

- Jules et Jim, 1961.

Uher, Štefan. My z deviatej A, 1961.

- Slnko v sieti, (Sunshine in the net),1962.

- Organ, 1964.

- Tri dcéry, 1965.

- Panna zázračnica, 1966.

- Genius, 1969.

Vávra, Otakar. Předtucha, 1947.

- Němá barikáda, 1949.

- Jan Hus, 1954.

- Jan Žižká, 1955.

- Proti všem, 1956.

- Občan Brych, 1958.

- Srpnová neděle, 1960.

Visconti, Luchino. Rocco e i suoi fratelli, 1960.

Vlček, Vladimír. Komedianti, 1953.

- Advent, 1956.

- V proudech, 1957.
Wajda, Andrzej. Pokolenie , 1954.
- Popiol a diamanti , 1958.
Weiss, Jiří.Uloupená hranice, 1947.
- Dravci, 1947.
- Vstanou novi bojovnící, 1950.
- Hra o život, 1956.
- Vlčí jáma, 1957.
- Romeo, Julie a tma, 1959.
- Taková láska, 1959.